

A Study of Some Aspects of Marriage as  
presented in selected octosyllabic French romances  
of the 12th & 13th centuries

by

Sally Louise Burch  
(University College)

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in  
the University of London  
1982

### Abstract

It is often assumed that love in Old French romances derives from Provençal fin'amors, in which love and marriage are incompatible. Yet in at least half the surviving octosyllabic romances written before 1300, love leads to marriage. The present thesis studies these "marital" romances. Part I discusses modern critics' views on the importance of Provençal influence. Later sections look at marriage as it affects heroes and heroines of romances. Love and marriage are very closely associated for these protagonists, who normally reject both marriage without love, and love without marriage. However, the idea of marriage for love conflicts with the feudal concept of marriage for profit or political advantage. These problems are generally solved by the combination of both concepts in the wedding of hero and heroine. Since the heroine is generally an heiress, while the hero is of lower rank, and may be poor, marriage to the heroine brings him wealth and status, as well as fulfilment in love. After his wedding, the hero acts as a good feudal lord, arranging rich marriages for his followers. Such heroes embody the aspirations of landless knights of the period, performing military service in the hope of being rewarded by a wife and lands. However, the difference in rank creates problems for both partners; these are studied, as are the problem of the couple's decision on pre-marital chastity, and the position of the heroine forced into an unwelcome match. A separate section describes the developing canon law of marriage at the period. This enables comparisons to be made between the romances and contemporary Church doctrine. Although the romances reflect some aspects of canon law, in many cases they reflect instead the matrimonial customs of the feudal aristocracy, which frequently conflicted with the pattern the Church was currently seeking to impose.



### Preface

The idea of looking at the way in which marriage is presented in Old French romances was suggested to me by Professor Brian Woledge, who considered that students of the love element in the romances had tended to concentrate on "courtly love" and on the extra-marital affairs associated with it, and that it might be useful to try to redress the balance by a study of the way romance-writers treated marriage, especially the connexion between marriage and love.

In deciding which works I should use as a basis for the study, I took as a starting-point the description of romances given by M. Faral : "Nous avons conservé, du XIIe siècle, un certain nombre d'oeuvres écrites en vers de huit syllabes, généralement assez développées (leur longueur varie de 8,000 à 30,000 vers), et qui ont pour sujet des histoires de chevalerie et d'amour; elles portent le titre de romans." (1). Since the same form and spirit could be seen in many works written after 1200, several of which - for instance, those by Jean Renart - appeared to be fine examples of the genre, I did not confine my choice to the 12th century, but took instead the year 1300 as marking a convenient limit to the period in which I was interested.

I next considered whether to include the shorter lais and dits. These, as M. Faral points out, are in many ways so closely linked with the romances that "une obligation s'impose, quand on les étudie, qui est de les considérer comme formant un bloc indissoluble." (Op.cit., p.392)

---

(1) E. Faral, Recherches sur les Sources des Contes et Romans Courtois (Paris 1913), p.391. It seems that the figure 8 here must be a misprint, for many of the romances M. Faral uses as examples are under 8,000 lines long. Since one of the works he mentions, Floire et Blancheflor, is only just over 3,000 lines in length, it seems probable that the figure 3 was originally intended.



Although in full agreement with this general principle, I nevertheless felt that the lais were less suitable for my particular purpose than the romances. M. Faral himself describes the lai as "plus bref, plus rapide, plus étroitement noué" than the romance (loc.cit.), and it seemed to me that, by their very brevity, the lais could not provide the development and analysis of a complex situation which I hoped to find in the romances. I have therefore neglected most of the lais and dits, and any other tales which, though not described as lais, are under 2,500 lines in length (2). The Lais of Marie de France, however, could not be ignored, and I included them on a supplementary basis, to provide a comparison between the romances and the best representatives of the lai, and also to introduce a woman's voice among the masculine authors of the romances.

My material, then, consisted mainly of Old French narrative literature of 2,500 or more lines, written in octosyllabic rhyming couplets in the 12th and 13th centuries, and dealing with love and chivalry. From among the sixty or so works which fulfil these conditions of length, metre, period and subject, I selected as the basis for my study those romances in which the marriage of the hero to the heroine appeared to be a significant point in the development of the work as a whole. In so doing, I found myself obliged to exclude such important texts as Chrétien's Charete, the two versions of Tristan, and the Grail romances, for none of these works centres around the marriage of the hero and heroine. Several other Arthurian romances, such as Meriadeuc or the Vengeance Raguidel, also seemed unsuitable for my purpose, since,

---

(2) The figure of 2,500 lines, rather than M. Faral's (presumed) 3,000, was chosen because it enabled me to include interesting works of just under 3,000 lines, such as Gliglois.

although the hero does marry, the author appears more interested in his hero's adventures than in his marriage (3). I was thus able to restrict my field of survey to some three dozen works, which are listed on p. 585 below.

In the course of my work, I found that some of the texts I had chosen deserved particular attention. These were, in alphabetical order, Amadas et Ydoine, Cligès, Durmart le Galois, Erec et Enide, L'Escoufle, Floire et Blancheflor, Florimont, Galeran de Bretagne, Guillaume de Dole, Ille et Galeron, Ipomedon, Jean et Blonde, La Manekine, Partonopeus de Blois, and Yvain, all of which I singled out for especially detailed study.

The situations and attitudes described in these fifteen romances furnished the material on which I have chiefly concentrated. The other romances listed on p. 585 were used to illustrate particular points, and to provide a more general picture than that given by the smaller group of fifteen. The lais of Marie de France were used mainly to compare or contrast the attitudes found in the romances with those in her lais, but were not examined as closely as the romances selected for special analysis.

By imposing these criteria, I was able to reduce a very wide field of study to more manageable proportions. I have, however, tried to fill the gaps left by the need to concentrate on a few works, by reading summaries of as many as possible Old French romances apart from those listed on p. 585 (4). This has enabled me, on occasion, to relate

---

(3) I also omitted several romances which in fact fulfilled my conditions of form, content, date, etc., simply because they seemed to add nothing to the picture I had already built up from the three dozen texts I did examine. At the same time, potentially interesting works such as Aucassin et Nicolette were regrettably excluded on grounds of versification. Such omissions indicate the inevitably arbitrary nature of this kind of selection procedure, which was, however, made necessary by the sheer volume of material available.

(4) For these summaries, I relied principally on J.D. Bruce, The Evolution of Arthurian Romance, vol. II, (Göttingen 1923), and on L'Histoire Littéraire de la France, vols XVIII and XXII, (Paris 1895). I also used summaries provided in editions of the texts themselves, where available.

my findings to the genre of Old French octosyllabic romance as a whole. It will also be seen that I have, at times, referred in detail to episodes in romances other than those selected as the basis for this study. An example is the romance of Joufroi de Poitiers, which can hardly be said to centre on the marriage of the hero and heroine, but which nevertheless contains incidents where the hero's marital adventures form an interesting contrast to the behaviour of more conventional heroes. As most of the episodes thus included are less than 2,000 lines in length, my decision to use them was not consistent with my earlier rejection of the lais and shorter romances. However, when such incidents form part of a longer work, the parts of the romance not directly concerned with marriage nevertheless supply a background which enables one to see the marriage in a broad context of events, and not as an isolated incident. Some of the marriages in the romances of Thèbes and Troie, for example, gain in significance by being seen in the perspective of a society at war. Thus such episodes often have an interest which is out of proportion with the number of lines devoted to them, and I felt that I could justifiably use them as material for my study.

Having thus established which Old French romances I would examine, I next had to determine whether I would consider all the aspects of marriage contained in these texts, or whether I would concentrate on certain aspects only. It soon became apparent that a full study of all the political, legal, economic, social, religious and personal aspects of marriage presented in my chosen romances would somewhat exceed the bounds of a Ph.D. thesis. I therefore decided to analyse

marriage in a more limited way, and to deal mainly with the personal point of view, since this fitted most closely with my original aim of discovering how far "courtly love" was connected with marriage.

This decision in turn led me to concentrate on the attitudes of heroes and heroines to their own future marriage, since it is from the point of view of the betrothed, rather than of the married couple, that the personal aspects of marriage are most frequently presented in my chosen texts. Indeed, having decided to deal with those romances in which the marriage of hero and heroine played an important part, I found that the great majority of them describe the adventures of young engaged couples, and end at, or shortly after, the wedding. Married life, on the other hand, is seldom the subject of a romance. Even among those works where the protagonists marry each other at an early stage, such as Guillaume d'Angleterre, Eracle, Clariss et Iariss, and even Chrétien's Yvain, we see far less of the relationship of husband and wife to each other than of their adventures, conjugal or otherwise, with third parties. In keeping with this pre-marital emphasis in the texts, then, my own study looks at the personal aspects of marriage mainly from the point of view of the young unmarried lover. I have, moreover, paid particular attention to the difference in outlook between the fiancé and the fiancée, and have therefore devoted separate sections to the heroes and to the heroines of my chosen texts.

Although choosing to concentrate on the personal side of marriage, I clearly could not altogether ignore its other, more general aspect. In particular, I felt that matrimonial law was too important to neglect,

since it is, ultimately, through the law that society brings pressure to bear on the individual. Thus it could be said that the medieval laws of matrimony represented the way in which the social, political, economic and religious aspects of marriage at the period actually limited and delimited the individual's possible field of action. Accordingly, I have included references to French and Anglo-Norman customary law where appropriate, and have attempted in Part II to analyse the complex topic of the canon law of marriage in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

Thus the research represented by this thesis is based on a fairly large group of Old French octosyllabic romances, selected on a slightly arbitrary basis, but nevertheless representing, I consider, the bulk of such works in which the marriage of hero and heroine is a key element. From among the works chosen for this study, a small group were given especially detailed analysis : and from among those not chosen, certain episodes were nevertheless examined. I have concentrated on the personal attitudes of the protagonists towards their own marriage, but have on occasion set this individual approach against a more general background of Old French octosyllabic romance as a whole. I have also examined the legal background to marriage at the period, paying special attention to the legal system which had most relevance to marriage, that of canon law.

I should like to acknowledge with gratitude the financial assistance of the Department of French, UCL, and of the Fielden Fund, in the typing and duplicating of this thesis; the untiring support of Professor M.A. Screech, who "Faite m'en a mainte assaillie...Que je traisisse l'uevre a fin" (5); and the unfailingly perceptive, patient and stimulating criticism and help of Professor Brian Woledge, who supervised my work and to whom it is respectfully and affectionately dedicated.

(5) Eracle, ed. Löseth, lines 6554-6.

## Part I

### Some Previous Work on Marriage in Old French Romances.

I shall not attempt here to give an account of all the numerous books and articles which make some reference to marriage in connexion with Old French romances. My aim is rather to give a general picture of some of the main trends in modern literary criticism on the subject, and to indicate the extent to which these trends have been followed.

One of the more persistent notes in critical evaluation of the rôle of marriage in Old French romances was struck by Gaston Paris when, in an article published in 1883, he defined love of the type found in Chrétien's Charrete as being essentially extra-conjugal: "On ne conçoit pas de rapports pareils entre mari et femme." (1). Similarly, in his assessment of Cligès, Paris found that the work idealised a love "pour lequel mariage et adultère sont des considérations tout à fait accessoires et même négligeables, la seule chose essentielle étant la pleine et exclusive possession des deux amants l'un par l'autre." (2). Thus, according to Paris, marriage was virtually irrelevant in these two works; it had little to do with the story, and nothing to do with the emotions of the chief characters. Nor did Paris

---

(1) "Lancelot du Lac II : Le Conte de la Charrette", Romania XII (1883), p.518. It was in this article that Paris coined the term "amour courtois" to describe the refined art of adulterous love found in the Charrete.

(2) "Cligès", fourth article on W.Foerster's 1901 edition of the text, Journ'l des Savants 1902, p.445.

confine his remarks to Chrétien's texts. He stated that the idealised adulterous love depicted in the Charrete had launched a widespread vogue, and "devait pendant longtemps éblouir et dominer" the world of medieval literature (3).

The general impression that love in medieval literature was essentially non-marital, if not actually adulterous, and that medieval literature was not in any case concerned with marriage, soon gained ground. In 1909, Myrrha Borodine noted that "amour courtois" was being used as a blanket term for "les nuances les plus différentes, souvent aussi les sentiments les plus hétérogènes que l'on trouve dans la littérature médiévale", and expressed her opinion that Paris "généralise là où l'on n'a pas encore le droit de le faire." (4).

Although Mlle Borodine pointed out the importance of marriage in Yvain and particularly in Cligès (5), it continued to be accepted by many critics that courtly romances were concerned mainly with "courtly love", and that "courtly love" was essentially adulterous. This view was nourished by a confusion between the fin'amors of Provençal lyrics and the kind of love described in the romances of Northern France (6),

---

(3) "Le Conte de la Charrette", Romania XII, p.519.

(4) La Femme et l'Amour au XIIe siècle (Paris 1909), pp.189-190.

(5) Ibid., p.96 n.1; pp.148-9; p.237 and note.

(6) Gaston Paris, in his article on the Charrete, had noted that Provençal love was one of the sources of "amour courtois" (Romania XII, pp.519 ff.)

Most critics agree that there is a strong element of adulterous love in the troubadours' songs. However, this view has recently been strongly attacked by A.R.Press in his article "The adulterous nature of 'Fin'amors'. A re-examination of the theory", Forum for Modern Language Studies 6 (1970), pp.327-341.

and also by a possibly too literal interpretation of the first two books of Andreas Capellanus' De Amore. In particular, the judgment attributed by Andreas to Marie de Champagne, that "amorem non posse suas inter duos iugales extendere vires" (7), has sometimes been taken as a rule which all Old French romancers were bound to follow. Thus Miss C.B. West, although aware that "the definition of courtly love as almost necessarily unlawful does not always hold good", quotes Andreas in support of her view that "for courtoisie in its purest form, love is an end in itself, and quite independent of marriage". She goes on to describe the relationship of "courtly" lovers as "an ideal one, far removed from domestic responsibilities, since marriage either does not enter into it or else is kept in the background and represented from the point of view of the individuals whose life it crowns, with little or no thought of their possible descendants and of the social significance of marriage." (8). For Miss West, then, marriage is either non-existent or irrelevant in most "courtly" romances, and when the writers of some Anglo-Norman works pay attention to marriage, they show that they are not "fundamentally courtois." Amadas et Ydoine, for example, shows a "spirit that is opposed to courtoisie" because in it "marriage, far from being regarded as incompatible with love, is taken as a matter of course." Miss West makes the same

---

(7) De Amore Libri Tres, edited by E. Trojel, second edition (Munich 1964), p. 153; transl. by Claude Buridant as "l'amour ne peut étendre ses droits entre deux époux." (André le Chapelain, Traité de l'Amour Courtois, (Paris 1974), p. 111).

(8) Courtoisie in Anglo-Norman Literature, (Oxford 1938), pp. 15-16.



sort of remarks about Gui de Warewic and Hue de Rotelande's Ipomedon, both of which are "uncourtly" in that they do not dissociate love from marriage (9). Having thus decided that marriage is "uncourtly" and therefore outside the scope of her book, Miss West does not pay much attention to it, even though, in six of the seven romances she discusses, the marriage of the hero to the heroine is either the goal or the turning-point of the plot.

The same assumptions - that "courtly" romances deal only with extra-marital "courtly" love, and ignore or subvert the idea of marriage - seem to underlie other critical analyses of Old French literature. Robert Bossuat, for example, in his volume on Le Moyen Age, speaks of "le lyrisme provençal, tout entier consacré à la gloire de la femme, non l'épouse ou la mère, mais l'amante", whose influence in the courts of Northern France generated a new literary genre : the courtly romance (10). Having thus placed the romances in the same category as the Provençal celebration of the domna, Bossuat goes on to link them with Andreas, whose book - which, in his view, gives a true picture of social pleasures at the court of Henry II - defines contemporary ideas of love: "illégitime et furtif, l'amour courtois ne s'entend guère qu'en dehors du mariage, car celui-ci implique la possession sans risque, alors que l'amour ne peut

\_\_\_\_\_

(9) Ibid., pp.118-9, p.68 & p.84.

(10) J. Calvet. Histoire de la Littérature Française, 9 vols (Paris 1931-6), vol.I, Le Moyen Age, pp.82-3.

vivre que d'inquiétude et d'instabilité." This is the love we find in the Arthurian romances: "Avec Lancelot, l'amour courtois devient l'élément primordial des romans de la Table Ronde." (11). Similarly, in a book "destiné aux étudiants qui préparent la candidature ou l'examen d'Enseignement supérieur", we learn that amour courtois is depicted in romances in general, and that "le plus souvent - pour ainsi dire toujours - ces amours devront rester secrètes, car l'amour courtois s'adresse à une femme mariée." (12).

It is possible that some of these opinions are not formed from study of the texts themselves, but simply accepted uncritically from the work of previous scholars (13). However, even such a carefully-considered work as Pierre Le Gentil's Littérature Française du Moyen Age may also create the impression that the chief function of marriage in Old French romances is that of providing a frame for the portrayal of courtly adultery. M. Le Gentil defines the idealised lady of Provençal poetry, who "ne saurait être la jeune fille ... encore ... soumise à toutes sortes de tutelles" and "ne peut être davantage l'épouse, car le mariage est incompatible avec l'amour vrai", as a Dame. The same word is then used for the lady who

---

(11) Ibid., pp.102-4.

(12) Louis Kukenheim & Henri Roussel, Guide de la Littérature Française du Moyen Age, third edition (Leiden 1963), pp.38-40.

(13) Bossuat's "illégitime et furtif", for example, reminds one of Paris' remark that courtly love is "illégitime, furtif" in "Le Conte de la Charrette", Romania XII, p.518.

inspires the ideal knight envisaged by Northern courtly society :  
 "Pas de vraie chevalerie qu'une Dame n'inspire, pas de vrai gloire  
 qu'une Dame ne partage." (15). Again, the words courtois and  
courtoisie, used to describe the romances and their contents,  
 have in M. Le Gentil's book the sense of "idealised adulterous  
 love" which is so often associated with them by other writers (16).  
 It is in this insidious way that Gaston Paris' definition of  
 "amour courtois" has continued to colour the picture given by  
 more modern critics of the place of marriage in Old French  
 romances.

Before leaving what I shall call the "courtly" school of  
 thought, a few remarks must be made about one of its most  
 outspoken adherents : R. R. Bezzola. In a book concerned mainly  
 with Chrétien's Erec et Enide, M. Bezzola sets out to show that,  
 in this story of a young married couple, marriage and married  
 love are the least important elements. Indeed, marriage is  
 excluded from the whole of twelfth-century French love-literature :

---

(15) La Littérature Française du Moyen Age, fourth edition  
 (Paris 1972), p.56 & p.78.

(16) Ibid., p.56: "L'amant courtois s'adresse à une femme mariée";  
 p.83 : "Pour qu'elle [la passion] se distingue d'un banal adultère,  
 il faut qu'un idéal non seulement l'excuse, mais incite à  
 l'admirer ... La matière de Bretagne était riche; elle offrait à  
 la courtoisie des sujets qui lui convenaient mieux [que le Tristan];"  
 p.90, Chrétien's courtoisie is contrasted with his desire to  
 "réhabiliter le mariage d'amour."

"L'amour conjugal n'y jouait absolument aucun rôle. Depuis qu'on parlait d'amour, depuis qu'on chantait l'amour, c'est-à-dire depuis 1120 environ, on n'avait établi aucune connexion entre amour et mariage : bien au contraire, André le Chapelain, le grand théoricien de l'amour courtois, les déclarait incompatibles." (17). Far from being associated with marriage, love in Old French literature is either the "exaltation erotico-mystique" of the troubadours, or the "passion fatale" of the Tristan legend, "passion qui est aussi celle des protagonistes des romans courtois depuis Le Roman d'Eneas, Ille et Galeron, Floire et Blancheflor, jusqu'aux nombreux romans d'aventure et aux romans arthuriens qui s'échelonnent entre 1170 et 1300" (18). Married love is, in Bezzola's view, as foreign to Erec as it is to Chrétien's other romances ("Où voit-on dans Cligès ou dans le Chevalier au Lion la moindre trace d'amour conjugal"? he asks, rhetorically)(19) and to courtly literature in general : far from being seen as the outcome of love, "le mariage a tout au contraire gravement compromis ce que Chrétien et ses contemporains entendaient par l'amour." (20). Elaborating on this last statement, Bezzola goes on to show how dangerous marriage is for Erec and Enide. Encouraging them to enjoy only each other's company, it separates them from the rest of society, and at the same time deprives Erec of his motive (the conquest of love) for seeking honour in

---

(17) Le Sens de L'Aventure et de L'Amour (Chrétien de Troyes), second edition, (Paris 1968), p.78.

(18) Ibid., p.79.

(19) Ibid., loc.cit.

(20) Ibid., p.80.

tournaments, and demotes Enide from the status of Dame to that of a mere wife who cannot inspire her husband to deeds of prowess : "Le chevalier ne "tournoie" pas en l'honneur de sa femme, mais bien pour conquérir toujours à nouveau les graces de sa dame." (21). Bezzola's subsequent analysis of the romance seeks to show how, through a series of symbolic adventures, Erec and Enide recover the status of perfect knight and perfect dame which they had lost through marriage, and re-discover their rightful place in society.

Le Sens de L'Aventure et de l'Amour provoked a good deal of comment following its first appearance in 1947 (22), and several critics - J. Misrahi and W. A. Nitze in particular - attacked its attitude to marriage as a distortion. Bezzola himself takes account of these attacks in the Postface to the second edition of the book, where he speaks of "de simples malentendus contre lesquels je m'étais peut-être trop peu muni, comme par exemple dans la fameuse question du mariage dans l'amour", and continues by justifying his position : "Je n'ai jamais prétendu que Chrétien considérait l'amour impossible dans le mariage, mais bien que, d'accord avec ses contemporains, il voyait dans le mariage un danger pour l'amour courtois, danger qu'Erec et Enide finissent par surmonter en conservant un amour idéal malgré le mariage" (23).

---

(21) Ibid., p.141.

(22) See, for example, the reviews by W. A. Nitze (Speculum 23 (1948) pp.290-4), M. Delbouille (Erasmus 2, (1949) pp.406-9), K. Sneyders de Vogel, (Neophilologus 33 (1949) pp.243-4) and J. Misrahi (Romance Philology 4 (1950-51) pp.348-61).

(23) Op. cit., p.2 of the Postface.

This, however, is hardly a retraction, and M. Bezzola reproduces his text of 1947 unaltered in the 1968 edition, as well as summarizing his views on Erec et Enide in his major study of courtly literature (24). It therefore seems reasonable to conclude that his opinions are still those found in both editions of De l'Aventure et de l'Amour, namely that love in medieval romances is unconnected with marriage, that the romances never touch on conjugal love, and that Chrétien saw marriage as a snare and delusion, turning true lovers from the path of perfection.

Bezzola's ideas have recently been used by an Australian critic as a basis for the argument that Chrétien's Yvain is concerned with the relationship between "courtly love" and prowess, and not with marriage (25). Opposing Professor Frappier's interpretation of Yvain as a "reconciliation of courtly love and marriage" (p.265), Halligan maintains that the marriage of Yvain and Laudine is only "incidental" (pp.271-2), while "the really important issue is the proper aim of chivalry in a knight" (p.276). Like the other critics we have examined, he assumes that marriage and "courtly love" are incompatible, and is led to conclude that the situation between Yvain and Laudine is not a marriage at all, but "an extreme form of courtly liaison" (p.273) replacing a marriage which, for Halligan as for Bezzola, is simply an obstacle in the path to perfect knighthood (pp.277-8).

---

(24) Les Origines et la Formation de la Littérature courtoise en Occident (500-1200), 5 vols, (Paris 1944-63), pt 3 i p.308, pt 3 ii p.386.

(25) G. J. Halligan, "Marriage in Chrétien's Yvain", AUN LA 34 (1970), pp.264-285.

Thus the current which had its source in Paris' Romania article of 1883 is still flowing strongly, after nearly a hundred years of criticism of Old French literature. This current identifies courtly love with adultery, and assumes that any love depicted in Old French romances must therefore be extra-conjugal in some way : if it is not frankly adulterous, it must be quite independent of marriage. Marriage can have no positive part to play in the life of the courtly lover; at best, it is irrelevant, and at worst it is a hindrance to the lover's true development.

However, this one-sided view of the place of love and marriage in Old French literature has been strongly opposed by other critics. Indeed, the argument has been pushed to the opposite extreme, and scholars of the Robertsonian school in the United States have stated that "amour courtois" is a myth invented by Gaston Paris (26). Adulterous courtly love,

---

(26) Robertson's thesis is based on the view that all medieval authors, whatever their apparent subject, were seeking to teach Charity and to oppose Cupidity. Hence, any text which appears to glorify carnal love, or Cupidity, should be read as an ironical treatise against such love. See D. W. Robertson Jr, "The Doctrine of Charity in Medieval Literary Gardens: A Topical Approach through Symbolism and Allegory", Speculum 26 (1951) pp.24-49; idem, "Some Medieval Literary Terminology, with special reference to Chrétien de Troyes", Studies in Philology 48 (1951) pp.669-692; idem, "The Subject of the De Amore of Andreas Capellanus", Modern Philology 50 (1952-3) pp.145-161; idem, A Preface to Chaucer (Princeton, 1963); idem, "The Concept of Courtly Love as an Impediment to the Understanding of Medieval texts", in The Meaning of Courtly Love, edited by F. X. Newman (Albany, 1968). Some other books and articles which follow the Robertsonian approach are: E. T. Donaldson, Speaking of Chaucer (London, 1970) esp. pp. 154-63 on "The Myth of Courtly Love"; Henry A. Kelly, Love and Marriage in the Age of Chaucer (Ithaca and London, 1975); and the other contributors to the symposium on The Meaning of Courtly Love, referred to above. The views of this school are discussed in R. Boase, The Origin and Meaning of Courtly Love (Manchester 1977), pp.47-8 and 111-4.

they contend, has no historical basis; the texts which appear to show evidence of its existence, such as Chrétien's Lancelot and Andreas' De Amore, were written in a purely ironic spirit, and must be read negatively, as parodies, rather than as positive descriptions of a certain art of loving.

Although their total denial that there was any idealisation of adulterous love in medieval France may seem to go too far, some of these American scholars have usefully counterbalanced the insistence of the "courtly" school on non-marital love. Speaking usually from the viewpoint of Chaucerian scholarship, they have pointed out that love and marriage were frequently associated in Chaucer and in his sources, and have paid some attention to medieval views on marriage itself. An article by J. F. Benton is a good example of both the merits and the demerits of this approach. (27). From an analysis of non-literary sources, Benton concludes that "the ideal of marriage, if not always the reality, was that there should be love between the spouses", and that "it was expected that marriage should produce love" between husband and wife (p.21). Marriage arising out of pre-marital love was not so uncommon as those who emphasise the feudal system of marrying for profit seem to believe. Love outside marriage was sometimes condoned, but often severely punished by the affronted husband; it is unlikely, thinks Benton,

---

(27) "Clio and Venus: an Historical view of Medieval Love", in The Meaning of Courtly Love, edited by Francis X. Newman (Albany, 1968), pp.19-42.



that an adulterous troubadour would have lived to celebrate his conquest in song. In short, the literary idea of "courtly love", which separates love from marriage and extols adultery, finds little corroboration in medieval life to judge from the evidence of historical texts, and Benton concludes by proposing to banish the term altogether. Thus his findings are useful in that they reveal some of the more positive medieval views of marriage which are not necessarily evident in courtly literature, although they certainly underlie many of the romances written in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. At the same time, Benton's refusal to admit any evidence from literary sources leads him to deny that there was any element in medieval love which could be called "courtly", and thus to neglect the distinguishing features of fine amors.

The scholar who has done most to settle the question of whether or not love in medieval French romances is essentially adulterous is, however, Jean Frappier. He has corrected the extreme views of both the "courtly" and the Robertsonian schools by showing that an emphasis on adultery, while essential to the lyrics of the langue d'oc, is misleading when applied to the romances of the langue d'oïl. In an article first published in 1959, Frappier analysed some of the confused terminology which has bedevilled modern criticism, confounding courtoisie with the so-called amour courtois, with Provençal cortezia and fin'amors (28). M. Frappier points out that love and courtoisie

---

(28) "Vues sur les conceptions courtoises dans les littératures d'oc et d'oïl au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle", CCM 2, 1959, pp.135-156. Reprinted in J. Frappier, Amour Courtois et Table Ronde (Geneva 1973), pp.1-31.

in Northern France were not simply copies of Provençal ideas, but indigenous products with their own ideals and terminology. One of the chief differences between the two cultures is that, in the North, love was generally compatible with moral, social and religious expectations; it led to marriage. "Hostiles en général à l'union libre comme aux amours adultères, nos romanciers courtois préconisent volontiers le mariage d'amour"(29). In an age where marriages were arranged for reasons of interest, and where theologians saw the aim of marriage as procreation, the writers' attempt to "assurer dans le mariage tous les droits ou privilèges de l'amour" was both bold and original. Thus M. Frappier sets the surviving twelfth- and thirteenth-century literature on love and marriage in the cultural context of its place and period, and sweeps away many misconceptions which have arisen through interpreting that literature in the light of other, "foreign" ideas, whether Provençal or modern.

In a later article, Frappier discussed the views of Robertson, Benton and their colleagues. He pointed out that there was indeed historical evidence for the adulterous element in Provençal fin'amors, and that there was a certain perversity in seeing all medieval love-literature as an ironic condemnation of carnal love. At the same time, he accepted that it is probably a mistake to take Andreas' De Amore too seriously, and agreed that

---

(29) Art. cit.: p.144; p.14 of Amour Courtois et Table Ronde.

Andreas can best be seen as a quite orthodox member of the clergy who was using irony to undermine fine amors in his first two books before attacking it openly in his third (30).

M. Frappier's pupil, M. Lazar, elaborates on the ideas expressed in the article "Vues sur les conceptions courtoises" in his book Amour courtois et "Fin'Amors" (31). He, too, points out the differences between the conceptions of love in Provence and in Northern France, and follows his clear analysis of the Provençal ideal with an examination of the presentation of love in the Tristan legend, in Marie de France, and in Chrétien. He finds that it is reasonable to describe Chrétien's work in terms of amour courtois conjugal, and considers that he was a conscious innovator, who deliberately contrasted this conjugal love with fin'amors. As for Marie, she examined, in her own way, situations which echo certain Provençal themes. Lazar's analysis of the differences between "courtly love" in northern and southern France is particularly valuable.

---

(30) "Sur un Procès fait à l'Amour Courtois", Romania 93 (1972), pp.145-193. Reprinted in Jean Frappier, Amour Courtois et Table Ronde (Geneva 1973), pp.61-96.

(31) Amour Courtois et "Fin'Amors" dans la littérature française du XIIe siècle (Paris, 1964). Following the usage of Lazar and Frappier, I am referring to the love-code of Northern France as fine amors, and using the form fin'amors for that of Provence.

Nevertheless, it must be said that the attempts of Frappier and Lazar to introduce clarity and moderation into the debate over the prevalence of adultery in medieval literature have not yet succeeded. Indeed, the second edition of Bezzola's Le Sens de l'Aventure et de l'Amour on the one hand, and the Robertsonian essays in The Meaning of Courtly Love on the other hand, both appeared in 1968, after the work of the French scholars had been in print for some years. Moreover, the debate has been a wide-ranging one, dealing with the general issue of whether love in medieval literature as a whole was, or was not, essentially adulterous, rather than with the more specific question of marriage in Old French romances. Although a debate about the connexion between adultery and fine amors is clearly relevant to a study of marriage, it is not the same as an examination of marriage itself. The most positive contribution to a study of marriage has come from the Robertsonian school, but their work has been based on Chaucer, or on the Middle Ages in general, rather than on the French romances of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (32). Thus the argument about the nature of "courtly love", while important, has not led to much critical examination of the place of marriage in the texts which concern us here.

---

(32) The remarks of J. F. Benton about medieval views on marriage as seen in some historical sources have already been discussed in this chapter. Another helpful study is H. A. Kelly's Love and Marriage in the Age of Chaucer (Ithaca and London, 1975), which examines the classical and canonical background to some medieval ideas on marriage.

Scholars in the field of Old French literature have, however, remarked for some time on the importance of marriage in the romances, especially in those of Chrétien. We have already noted that Mlle Borodine emphasised the place of marriage in Chrétien's romances, and disputed the applicability of Paris' "amour courtois" to other works than the Charrete. Wendelin Foerster, too, considered that Lancelot's adulterous love was far from being Chrétien's ideal : "Denn Kristian, der die ideale Gattenliebe im Erec verherrlicht, der im Cligés wiederum die eheliche Liebe feiert, kann nicht plötzlich die ehebrecherische Liebe preisen und verhimmeln, um so weniger, als er unmittelbar darauf wieder im Ivain die eheliche Minne so meisterhaft schildert." (33).

This view of Chrétien as a man for whom marriage is the highest form of human love-relationship has found many adherents. E. Hoepffner saw in Erec "l'image idéale de l'amour conjugal", in which "le bonheur calme et l'union honnête de ses jeunes époux" was opposed to the fatal passion of couples such as Tristan and Iseut (34). W. A. Nitze, again writing on Erec, states that here, "as in all his other works except the Charrete, Chrétien upholds the ideal of marriage as the solution to the courtois problem" (35). For F. Schlösser, "Chrétien de Troyes, vom Sonderfall 'Lancelot' einmal abgesehen, in all seinen Romanen wenigstens den Versuch wagt, das Bild einer 'höfischen Ehe' zu

---

(33) Der Karrenritter, (Halle 1899), p.lxviii.

(34) "'Matiere' et 'sens' dans le roman d'Erec et Enide", Archivum Romanum 18 (1934) pp.449-450.

(35) "Erec and the Joy of the Court", Speculum 29, (1954) p.695.

zeichnen"; Chrétien "einen Weg weist, auch dort zu erobern und zu verdienen, wo man nach allgemeiner Auffassung einfachhin zu fordern und zu besitzen sich berechtigt glaubt : in der Ehe." (36). Jean Frappier, too, sees Chrétien's attitude to marriage in this light; for him, Chrétien presents "le mariage d'amour comme la forme d'union idéale" (37).

Other critics have given different emphases to Chrétien's preoccupation with marriage. For A. Pauphilet, for example, Chrétien was not so much concerned with extolling love-marriages as an ideal, as with examining and resolving the conflicts between marriage and chivalry or marriage and courtoisie (38). M. Lazar, too, sees Chrétien's work as being dominated by certain problems of marriage in chivalric society : "rapports entre la chevalerie et l'amour, entre l'amour courtois et le mariage; la passion amoureuse aboutissant à un mariage et non à la mort; la possibilité pour la femme mariée d'être une dame et une amie pour son époux" (39). Allowing for these variations in emphasis, however, it seems that the great majority of critics hold the view that Chrétien considered marriage, and not adulterous "amour courtois", to be the relationship which his heroes and heroines should ideally aim for in love, and that he was interested enough in marriage to be aware of its possible conflicts with other ideas of his time, such as the chivalric ideal.

---

(36) "Die Minneauffassung des Andreas Capellanus und die zeitgenössische Ehelehre", Zeitschrift für Deutsche Philologie 79, (1960) p.277.

(37) Chrétien de Troyes, second edition, (Paris 1968), p.62.

(38) Le Legs du Moyen-Âge, (Melm 1950), pp.153-165.

(39) Amour Courtois et Fin'Amors, (Paris 1964), p.199.

The impression is sometimes given, however, that Chrétien was almost alone in upholding the virtues of marriage, and that there was something daring and original in his refusal to dissociate marriage from love. F. Schlösser, in the extract we have already quoted from his article on Andreas, uses the word "wagt" for Chrétien's attempt to build up the picture of a "höfischen Ehe". Le Gentil, speaking of the genesis of Erec, comments on Chrétien's boldness : "Alors que tant d'autres autour de lui prônent l'adultère, c'est en effet l'histoire d'un mariage d'amour qu'il entreprend audacieusement de conter" (40). However, this current too has its counter-current, and several critics have commented on the frequency with which marriage, and not adultery, occurs in Old French romances other than those of Chrétien. Littré, for example, discussing the "poèmes d'aventure", went so far as to say that "il est d'usage dans ces sortes de romans qu'un jeune varlet devient amoureux de la fille de son seigneur ... et finit par obtenir la main de la dame, objet constant de ses pensées." (41). Mme Lot-Borodine, discussing idylls and romans d'aventure, notes that these works

---

(40) La Littérature Française du Moyen Age, fourth edition, (Paris 1972), p.85.

(41) Histoire Littéraire de la France, vol.22 (1852), p.841. Although referring particularly to Guy de Warewic, these remarks are clearly intended as a general description of what are now called "romans d'aventure".

"indiquent le goût persistant des vieux romanciers pour les amours juvéniles et honnêtes, leur dénouement restant invariable: la réunion du couple, après de longues épreuves, dans l'allégresse des justes noces." (42). The authors of a recent literary history go still further: "Le roman occidental est d'inspiration chrétienne: d'une part, le sens de la liberté, de la responsabilité, du mérite, et, d'autre part, celui de l'indissolubilité du mariage et de la fidélité conjugale en constituent les fondements assurés" (43).

Thus there is a considerable diversity of opinion among critics as to the place of marriage in Old French romances. The views we have quoted are typical of some of the main trends of thought on the subject, ranging from Bezzola's contention that marriage does not enter into the romances' picture of love, to assertions that Chrétien, at least, upheld marriage as an ideal, or that the romances as a whole are founded on the Christian concept of marriage.

The remarks we have been discussing, however, are often found in isolation in the work of the critics concerned, and are only occasionally reinforced by a more detailed examination of marriage as Old French romances present it. The books and articles

---

(42) De l'Amour Profane à l'Amour Sacré, (Paris 1961), p.16.

(43) Jacques Roger & Jean-Charles Payen, Histoire de la Littérature Française, 2 vols, (Paris 1969-70), vol.1, p.41.



which give the subject such a fuller treatment are indeed rare. Perhaps one of the earliest was Miss S. Barrow's Ph.D. thesis, published as The Medieval Society Romances (44), in which the analysis of "The Machinery of Courtly Love" and of "Courtly Love in Society" in a selected group of romances touches on marriage at several points.

Miss Barrow notes that the writers of Old French romances "generally prefer fine amor free from the adulterous taint condoned and legalised by Andreas" (p.33). In most of the romances she has chosen to examine, betrothal and marriage form a basic part of the plot-structure: betrothal is used to establish the lovers' mutual faith and thus provide a stronghold from which they can face the inevitable period of separation and opposition which tests their love, and marriage comes to crown that love with a pageantry which at once publicly vindicates the lovers, symbolises their final harmony with society, and delights the audience (pp.18-30). This eventual wedding, however, though "obviously planned to give a grand finale" (p.107), does not have great narrative value. Nevertheless, it is the lovers' goal, and may therefore determine the form of some of the adventures which lead up to it. The emphasis on chastity in many works, for example, arises partly because "the poet naturally takes care that his lovers do nothing to spoil the effect of a wedding which brings together, in union sanctioned by church and society, those whom fine amor has disciplined to its own and the world's satisfaction",

---

(44) New York, 1924.

and the kind of obstacles the lovers face are obstacles to marriage, such as "discrepancy in rank and fortune, parental opposition, or deference to conventional prejudice." (p.34). Another very common obstacle is the "counter matrimonial engagement", a reflection of the contemporary tendency to ignore personal feelings when arranging a marriage. The heroes and heroines of romance regard the possibility of such an arranged marriage as "an end to their happiness"; only minor characters envisage adultery as a solution (p.40). Adultery is not generally praised; often the poet makes his adulterous heroine a mal-mariée with good reason to rebel, and the Charrete and Le Châtelain de Coucy are exceptional works which ignore "the normal, conventional attitude to love" (pp.48-9 and p.40). In the romances which place particular emphasis on the growth of chivalry through love, marriage is again seen as the goal : "The final reward of knightly merit ... is marriage with the lady for whose sake the great deeds are done" (p.60). Using marriage in this way may create problems : "The lady won, what should be the married knight's career?", and works such as Erec, Yvain, Durmart and Fergus deal with this aspect of marriage.

Finally, Miss Barrow notes that, except in the handful of adulterous romances, marriage is seen as the entry into a "social paradise"; when it takes place, the hero and heroine are both acknowledged to belong to the highest rank in society, they are richly endowed, and the whole world smiles on them : "at the moment of their union, they find that the world loves nothing so much as lovers like them ... decorous, loyal, courteous, of high rank and ample fortune, who will not scant the wedding festivity." (pp.46-7 and p.31).

Miss Barrow's book seems to have been generally ignored by students of Old French literature, at least on this side of the Atlantic. It does, indeed, appear unscholarly; all the quotations are given in translation, and there is no bibliography. Nevertheless, Miss Barrow had obviously read all the works she discussed with attention and perception, and her views, though expressed in a rather flowery style, are both sound and illuminating. Hers is a work which, had it been better known, might have eliminated many of the misconceptions which are still so current in this field.

The German scholar F. Schlösser, to whose article on Andreas Capellanus we have already referred, sets both Andreas and his contemporaries, the romance-writers of the second half of the twelfth century, in the context of contemporary theological views on marriage. Noting that the theologians emphasised the fulfilment of conjugal duty and the procreation of children as the benefits of marriage, and condemned any enjoyment of sexual love between husband and wife for its own sake, Schlösser contrasts this with Chrétien's attempts to create a picture of "höfischen Ehe", and comments that "lange vor den erfreulichen Bestrebungen der Hochscholastik, auch der natürlichen Gattenliebe einen relativen Wert zuzuerkennen, schon in Laienkreisen das Ideal einer geistgelenkten und dennoch geschlechtlich voll gelebten Ehe gegenwärtig war." (45).

---

(45) "Die Minneauffassung des Andreas Capellanus und die zeitgenössische Ehelehre", Zeitschr. f. Deutsche Philologie 79, (1960) p.278.

Thus Schlösser thinks that Chrétien and his audience (the laienkreisen) sought to find a place in marriage for passionate love. In an article about Andreas Capellanus, however, such remarks on marriage in the romances are necessarily limited to a few generalisations. A more detailed study was published in the following year: Amour et Mariage dans la Littérature Française du Nord au Moyen-Âge, by Joseph Coppin (46). Coppin's book in fact covers the whole field of literature in the langue d'oïl from the "début de l'époque féodale" to the end of the fifteenth century in 137 pages, but he includes five chapters which discuss various octosyllabic romances. He first notes that the early chansons de geste, and also the chansons de toile, present an essentially masculine view of love and marriage : women are seen only through men's eyes, and a certain amount of male fantasy is present in the portrayal of the passionate Saracen princesses, or female protagonists of some chansons de toile, who break all social conventions in order to throw themselves at a handsome warrior. This male ethos is contrasted by Coppin with the growing feminine influence found in Wace's Brut and in the romans d'antiquité, where love begins to take an important place in the hero's life. Coppin does not, however, have much to say on the rôle of marriage in this "premier groupe de romans courtois".

Some shorter works, such as the Chastelaine de Vergi and the Lai de l'Ombre, are discussed by Coppin in a chapter on "L'Orthodoxie courtoise", which also includes an analysis of

---

(46) Paris, 1961.

Chrétien's Charrete; these works are grouped together under this heading because they all deal with adultery in some form. Coppin finds, however, that the shorter romances and lais "n'attaquent pas l'institution matrimoniale." (p.61). Their authors are interested in illustrating points of courtly theory, and in depicting a love which has its own laws, independent of those of convention and society : "ils font abstraction du mariage, de la règle, de la morale commune." (p.62). A further chapter deals with Bérout's Tristan and with Marie de France as examples of "amour-passion". Coppin seems to consider that Marie judged her characters according to their loyalty and fidelity; he notes that she is sympathetic to the adulterous loves of her mal-mariées, but condemns the treacherous wives in Bisclavret and Equitan. However, his remarks do not add greatly to our information on Marie's treatment of marriage.

In the more specific context of what he terms "romans d'amour conjugal", Coppin remarks, like Frappier, that the "hommes du Nord" respect marriage, and adapt the Provençal exaltation of adulterous love to fit in with a more conventional love for wife or fiancée. He draws attention to the arguments of the author of Durmart in favour of marrying one's beloved, and points out that there is no lack of love-marriages in Old French romances.. However, "l'amour heureux n'a pas d'histoire", and authors had to concentrate on pre-marital adventures, or dis-unite their married protagonists if they wanted to keep their audiences interested in such couples. Dismissing the adventures of

Guillaume d'Angleterre and Gratienne as "trop extraordinaires pour notre goût" (p.72), Coppin then concentrates his analysis of such troubled marriages on Chrétien's Erec and Yvain. He finds that both romances deal with the problem faced by a knight after he has won the lady whose love inspired him to great deeds : "Bien sûr que l'homme ne doit pas s'amoindrir par le mariage, oublier dans les douceurs du foyer son rôle d'homme; mais, d'autre part, la femme ne se marie pas pour que son mari la néglige et poursuive loin d'elle un rêve, si beau soit-il, d'héroïsme et de gloire." (pp.78-9). Coppin notes that this problem, seen from the man's point of view, was one faced by historical figures in the twelfth century (p.73). He does not consider that either of Chrétien's "romans conjugaux" gives a satisfactory solution to the dilemma. Erec sacrifices the woman's interests to those of the man, yet the man's quest for renown is itself somewhat hollow, "un idéal chevaleresque brillant et assez vain" (p.75). In Yvain, the interests of the husband and wife are more equally balanced, but the solution which Coppin detects - a "partage du temps entre l'aventure et l'amour" (p.78) - seems to him insufficient : "Mettre en vacances tantôt l'amour, tantôt l'héroïsme ... est-ce la solution? On peut souhaiter une association plus intime, une communauté plus étroite de l'homme et de la femme pour une tâche à laquelle chacun des époux apporterait ses ressources propres." (p.79). Altogether, the roman d'amour conjugal was of limited interest, thinks Coppin, and his failure to find more than three

examples of the genre seems to bear him out. Erec and Yvain, he remarks, only keep the audience's attention by becoming "romans d'aventure", and the other path which the history of a marriage could have taken, that of the "roman familial", was not followed (except, to some extent, by some chansons de geste) (pp.80-81). Medieval authors preferred stories of "les progrès d'un amour naissant" and the tribulations of young lovers.

Having analysed a selection of such "romans de fiançailles", and noted the incompatibility between the roman idyllique and the courtly ideal of love-service, Coppin concludes that, far from concentrating on the adulterous love of a married heroine, a medieval romance was very often a "roman de la jeune fille", ending in the heroine's marriage to her beloved.

Although Coppin does not appear to have read much contemporary criticism, his remarks tend mainly to confirm what Frappier and others had already said : that romances in the langue d'oïl saw the fulfilment of love in marriage rather than in adultery, and that Chrétien in particular had explored the relationship between love, marriage and chivalry. A great deal of his book consists of re-tellings of the stories of medieval works, which does not leave space for him to develop his critical assessments in any detail. However, his observations are sound, and he has the merit of drawing attention to the limited interest shown by Old French romance-writers in married love, as opposed to the popularity of the theme of betrothal.

Coppin, like Frappier and Lazar, thinks that Northern realism and good sense explain the preference for betrothal over adultery as the theme of most romances in the langue d'oïl. Other scholars have tried to explore further the reasons underlying the popularity of stories in which love ends in marriage. Erich Köhler, for example, examines this question in a chapter of his book Ideal und Wirklichkeit in der höfischen Epik, first published in 1956 and translated into French in 1970 (47). Köhler considers that there was a "crisis of identity" in twelfth century courtly society in France, and that the romances, particularly those of Chrétien, attempted to solve this crisis by providing new images of the ideal knight or lady, and new goals for chivalric society to aim at. The solution was to rehabilitate love and marriage as powerful motive forces :

L'amour et la femme étaient la source des vertus qui assuraient au chevalier sa position prépondérante dans la société féodale, voire dans l'ordre définitif, et lui assignaient sa mission historique. C'est pourquoi l'amour et la femme devaient être à l'abri d'une morale rigoriste ... Ainsi se posait la tâche de faire concorder la nature éducative de l'amour courtois et les exigences d'une relation amoureuse conduisant au mariage, c'est-à-dire de prouver que la tension nécessaire au perfectionnement et à l'ennoblissement de l'homme existait également dans l'union amoureuse légale. Il fallait sauver l'amour courtois pour l'image idéale du chevalier, et le mariage pour l'amour courtois. (p.164).

---

(47) L'Aventure Chevaleresque. Idéal et réalité dans le roman courtois, trans. by Eliane Kaufholz (Paris 1975), pp.160-207 ("Intensification et transformation de la tension entre idéal et réalité dans l'amour").



Thus the preference for marriage was an attempt to direct the ennobling power of Provençal love-service towards legitimate ends, exalting chivalry without the taint of adultery. However, in order to maintain the stimulating power of love, its satisfaction in marriage had to be almost indefinitely postponed. This, Köhler thinks, was an important factor in the creation of romance as a genre : "la nécessité d'introduire le mariage dans l'amour courtois imposait la représentation de la distance (entre les amants) et des efforts entrepris pour la surmonter, elle appelait donc le roman." (p.165). The new genre, then, demonstrated that marriage-directed love purified and enhanced the endeavours of the knight; but in so doing, it concentrated on the endeavours rather than on the marriage : "le chemin conduisant au mariage était plus important que le mariage lui-même" (pp.164-5).

Ultimately, this attempt to reconcile courtly love and marriage, the will to achieve and the achievement itself, was doomed to failure, thinks Köhler. The solution of making marriage a far-distant goal still left unanswered the problem of the knight's inspiration after his marriage : "le mariage qui s'accomplit après la longue mise à l'épreuve ne mettra-t-il pas tout de même une fin aux efforts de l'homme?" (p.165). Even more serious, Köhler considers, was the incompatibility between married love and social action to which Bezzola had drawn attention, namely that marriage separates the couple from society in their own private relationship, and does not

contribute to the raising of a social ideal once it has been achieved. Chrétien de Troyes, in particular, was very aware of these problems, thinks Köhler. He traces Chrétien's handling of these questions in Erec, Cligès, Lancelot and Yvain, trying to show that all these works attempt to demonstrate "l'autonomie de l'homme chevaleresque qui s'épanouit dans la société et reçoit d'elle les lois de son comportement." (p.180). However, he believes that Chrétien finally abandoned his attempt to reintegrate love and marriage and combine them as an ennobling force in society; his last hero, Perceval, goes beyond earthly to heavenly love.

M. Köhler's ideas, as some of my quotations may have indicated, are not expressed with absolute clarity (48) and at times he seems to advance theories which are not altogether supported by the texts. This is particularly so when he seeks to demonstrate that, in all of his romances except Perceval, Chrétien is attempting to set up a self-sufficient, rational ideal of life modelled on love, "l'idéale d'une identification entre la conduite de la vie et l'amour" (p.207). Nevertheless, he makes a valuable contribution by emphasising the frequency with which marriage is set as the goal of love in Old French romances, and by suggesting possible explanations for the importance of the betrothal theme. His analysis does not, unfortunately, really come to grips with the question of why so few romance-writers were interested in what happened after the

---

(48) This is not the fault of the translator; W. Wolf, in a review in Neuphilologische Mitteilungen 59 (1958) pp.285-7, complains severely about Köhler's "Pseudophilosophen-Deutsch".

marriage, since he concentrates on one author - Chrétien - who is in fact interested in this question. Moreover, his attempt to explain the relative absence of married life from medieval romances on the ground that a love-marriage was seen as a threat to the life of society in general seems unsatisfactory; if such a threat were widely perceived, would one not expect literature to deal with it in some way, instead of ignoring it? Coppin's straightforward explanation, that a happy marriage simply doesn't make a good story, is surely preferable.

A somewhat different explanation for the popularity of the theme of betrothal or of the "quête nuptiale" in Old French romances is put forward by J. C. Payen (49). Payen contends that the preference for stories where love ends in marriage is considerably more noticeable in the thirteenth century than in the twelfth. He connects this preference with a general "demythification" of courtly ideology in the thirteenth century, and points to a number of incidents in the verse romances of the period which seem to betray "un pessimisme profond, qui met en doute l'idéal amoureux et laisse entrevoir la catin sous la dame ou la brute sous le héros." (p.217). This scepticism about courtly ideals is linked by Payen with the generally more realistic tone of thirteenth-century romances (p.223). The romance of the thirteenth century catered to "un public qui 's'embourgeoise'" (p.221), and therefore reflected a conventional, middle-class attitude to marriage. Adulterous or hopeless love,

---

(49) "La destruction des mythes courtois dans le roman arthurien: la femme dans le roman en vers après Chrétien de Troyes", Revue des Langues Romanes 78 (1969) pp.213-28.

which are both anti-social, are no longer popular. Instead, we find "un certain conformisme, qui tend à exalter l'amour légitime et à flétrir l'amour coupable," (p.221). Such an insistence on socially acceptable love is found in the romance, rather than in the lyric, because romances were seen as didactic works, in which the reader could follow the "message intellectuel et moral" (p.223) of the author's prologue. An example of this is Durmart, where the author transforms Jaufré Rudel's hopeless and isolating amor de lonh into a successful quest for a bride, ending in a happy marriage and in the couple's "bonheur parmi les hommes." (p.224). Durmart, notes Payen, is unusual in that the story continues after the wedding. It shows conjugal love leading to eternal salvation : "Apologie implicite de l'amour conjugal, Durmart peint sa ferveur infiniment sanctifiante." (p.224). Like Schlösser, Payen comments that this shows a greater respect for married love amongst lay people than amongst the theologians of the marriage-sacrament.

Thus the popularity of stories of betrothal is seen by Payen as a predominantly thirteenth-century phenomenon, which he connects with a growing taste for realism, and with a sceptical attitude to the idealised courtly lover and his unattainable married lady. Instead, a more down-to-earth public demanded an achievable, acceptable love to be depicted as the hero's goal in what was, to some extent, the didactic medium of the romance.

Joan M. Ferrante, in a book which discusses changing attitudes to women in medieval literature, makes some similar comments to those of Payen (50). She too sees a difference between the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, which for her lies in the increasingly "closed" nature of thirteenth-century society. Like Payen, she detects a certain disillusionment with courtly ideals in the thirteenth century, but she associates this, not with "embourgeoisement", but with a general loss of self-confidence and optimism. Uncertain of his values and goals, the man of the thirteenth century tried to reassert himself by an increasing repression of less privileged groups, such as Jews, heretics - and women. This is reflected in the changing rôle of women in literature. Women in medieval literature are, in any case, semi-allegorical figures, argues Ferrante; they are seen from the man's point of view and represent aspects of his nature and endeavours. Ferrante here unwittingly echoes some of Coppin's remarks, but she takes them much further. For her, women in medieval romances represent man's ability to love, or love itself. In the twelfth century, this potentially irrational force is seen in a positive way, as an aspect of man's nature (his emotions) which spurs him on to great deeds and with which he finally achieves perfect harmony, the harmony of a fully integrated personality: "[the woman's] presence in his life symbolises his potential

---

(50) Woman as Image in Medieval Literature from the twelfth century to Dante (New York and London, 1975).

excellence. His final union with her ... represents the completion of himself" (p.74). Thus marriage is the happy conclusion of the hero's struggle to reconcile love and reason. In the thirteenth century, this positive view of woman as the incarnation of a disturbing but valuable emotional force in men is rejected. The romances of the period increasingly present man's goal as sanctity, to which the woman is an impediment.

Thus Ferrante, like Köhler and Payen, seeks the explanation for the growth or decline of marriage in medieval literature in the changing mentality of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. That the three can come to such different conclusions about when there was a crisis of identity in French society, what sort of crisis it was and what its results were for the literary depiction of marriage, is sufficient indication of the difficulty and complexity of such a task.

Turning from these sociological interpretations of the rôle of marriage in Old French romances to the more conventional kind of literary criticism represented by Barrow and Coppin, we find that the most recent work in this field has been done by Mlle M. Guillet-Rydell. Unfortunately only a part of her thesis on L'Epopée Nuptiale dans Quelques Oeuvres Françaises du Moyen Age has, as far as I know, been published (51). From the entry in Dissertation Abstracts, we learn that she studied the "bride-winning theme" in representative examples of the epic, lay and

---

(51) Ph.D., University of Minnesota, 1968. 143 pp.

romance composed between about 1150 and 1220. She found that, in the epic, the hero's fight for a bride is always subordinated to loftier struggles for his God, king or family group. The rôle of the women in these texts ranges "from complete passivity to partial initiative." In the lai, the hero undertakes his bride-quest not primarily to win the bride, but in order to demonstrate his prowess and valour. In the romances, the woman takes the initiative: "she gives commands and imposes ordeals, among which prowess is the most important, and prowess is consequently subordinated to love." The woman's rôle nevertheless varies from "complete acceptance of the hero's plans to complete domination over his actions." (52). The romance differs from the other two genres in that it pays more attention to love than to prowess. Guillet-Rydell concludes that the originality of medieval French writers can be seen in their differing treatments of the bride-winning theme.

The most interesting of Guillet-Rydell's somewhat unsurprising findings would appear to be her conclusion about marriage and prowess in the lais. This is, moreover, the aspect of her research which she has since followed up in published form, in an article on marriage in the anonymous lais (53). Her remarks on this subject, even though they do not deal with the romances, are more directly relevant to our own topic than some of the other

---

(52) All quotations are taken from Dissertation Abstracts 30 (1969-70), 695A.

(53) "Nature et rôle du mariage dans les lais anonymes bretons", Romania 96 (1975) pp.91-104.

works discussed in this chapter. Guillet-Rydell notes that eight of the thirteen surviving anonymous lais deal with marriage. In six of these, she maintains, marriage is an essential element in the plot-structure, whereas in the other two it is just a "conclusion morale" to the hero's adventures, "commode peut-être pour le poète, mais superflue et sans liens réels avec le reste de la narration." (p.97). She considers that the authors of the eight lais she has studied felt obliged to include the marriage-theme in their works in order to make them acceptable to their audience, and that this explains the apparently contrived, artificial insertion of a wedding at the end of some otherwise self-sufficient love-stories.

Seeking to explain this apparent necessity for marriage to conclude such stories, she refers - as do other commentators, including Coppin, whom she quotes - to the realistic, practical, conventional spirit of Northern France, which rejected the anti-matrimonial love of Provence. She also stresses the social imperatives - the noblewoman's need for a protector, the general desire for heirs - which made matrimony not only the "législateur formel exigé par les institutions religieuses du temps" but also "l'élément stabilisateur ardemment recherché pour [des] raisons pratiques ... par les gens de cette époque." (p.104).

In her analysis of the lais themselves, Guillet-Rydell finds that they fall into three groups, according to whether marriage is seen in terms of adventure, of courtliness, or of adultery.



However, the marital elements she discovers in these eight lais do not, to my mind, justify her conclusion that marriage plays an important part in the structure of six of the eight plots. Nor does this conclusion take account of the fact that five more lais are omitted from her study on the grounds that they do not have anything to do with marriage at all, so that one can hardly say the marital theme has great significance in the anonymous lais as a whole. Nevertheless, her survey is admirably clear and thorough, and forms a very useful basis for comparison with the romances.

At the conclusion of this survey of the main trends in critical opinion on the subject of marriage in Old French verse romances, what have we found? We have seen that much of the discussion on this topic has centred on adultery and the definition of "amour courtois"; indeed, the question of whether love in the romances was, or was not, fundamentally extra-marital, is still being debated. (54). Scholars have argued that adultery was an essential part of all medieval ideas on love, and, conversely, that there was no adulterous element whatsoever in fine amor. The majority, however, would probably agree with Frappier that, while the love sung by the troubadours and by many trouvères is indeed adulterous, love in the octosyllabic romances of the North normally leads to a "happy-ever-after" marriage. This is certainly the view which my own research supports.

---

(54) A thorough survey of critical opinions on "amour courtois" is given by Roger Boase in his book The Origin and Meaning of Courtly Love : A critical study of European Scholarship (Manchester, 1977).

Nevertheless, although the fundamental importance of marriage in Old French romances is now fairly well established, there have been few general studies of the subject. Chrétien, of course, has long been singled out by scholars as a campaigner for the integration of fine amor and marriage, and it is generally recognised that, though most of his contemporaries thought as he did on this question, few were as conscious as he of the difficulties which would arise after the wedding. Chrétien's treatment of the problems of "amour courtois conjugal" has almost monopolised the attention of modern critics in this field - not, it must be said, without reason. Indeed, Chrétien's contribution to literature on the subject of marriage is so outstanding that it is hardly surprising that critics have been unable to tear themselves away from his multi-faceted, infinitely suggestive stories (55).

Those who have managed to flee the enchanter, and take a broader view of marriage in Old French romances, sometimes seem to become almost too general in their outlook. Seeking an explanation for the apparently extraordinary tendency of the romances to associate love and marriage, they are led to theorise about far-reaching crises and changes in medieval society and ways of thought as a whole. Of those who look at the actual presentation of marriage in the texts, I know of only two - Coppin, and

---

(55) Douglas Kelly's Chrétien de Troyes : an analytical bibliography (London, 1976) gives a comprehensive list of scholarly works on Chrétien; pp. 127-9 deal particularly with studies of love and marriage.

Guillet-Rydell's largely unpublished work - which specifically mention the marriage-theme in their titles, and even these are concerned with Old French literature in general and not with the romances in particular. Barrow, on the other hand, did not set out to examine the rôle of marriage, but did concentrate on the romances, and was led as a result to make many valuable observations on the attitudes to marriage in these works. In particular, she draws attention to the way marriage is used as the ultimate reward for the hero and heroine, conferring personal happiness, great wealth and high social status. She also shows how vital the betrothal theme is in the plot-structure of many romances, determining the kind of adventures the lovers meet and shaping the course of those adventures, as well as rewarding the lovers with marriage at the end. Coppin's work is less detailed than hers, and covers fewer romances, but he gives a balanced and useful survey of the place of marriage in different kinds of Old French literature, and seeks to explain the failure of romance-writers, apart from Chrétien, to deal with the married life of their heroes and heroines. This point is also commented on by Payen, who agrees with Coppin that the story of a love-marriage is basically uninteresting because "les gens heureux n'ont pas d'histoire." (56). Barrow, Coppin, Köhler and Guillet-Rydell all stress the importance of marriage in the romances and

---

(56) "La Destruction des Mythes Courtois", Revue des Langues Romanes 78 (1969) p.224.

lais they discuss, while Payen and Ferrante seem to feel that this point can be taken for granted, and no longer needs to be emphasised.

We find, then, that while much work has been done on love in Old French romances, comparatively little has been done on marriage, and that little is often of a general, speculative nature, rather than a close examination of the texts themselves.

## Part II

### The Legal Background: Some Aspects of the Canon Law of Marriage in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

During the period in which the romances discussed in this thesis were written, the matrimonial law of France and England - as indeed of the whole of Western Christendom - was almost exclusively the province of the Church. The only matters regulated by civil law were the strictly material questions of dower and inheritance, and even here the lay courts had to abide by the Church's ruling on the validity of a marriage or the legitimacy of children. As Beaumanoir warned his readers : "Li secons cas [after heresy] du quel la juridicions appartient a sainte Eglise, c'est de mariage ... Et de toutes les causes qui en pueent nestre et devant le mariage et après le mariage, et liquel mariage sont a souffrir et liquel non, la connoissance appartient a l'evesque, ne ne s'en doit meller la laie justice" (1).

What, then, was the law of the Church, which formed the background to the attitudes to marriage which we find in the octosyllabic romances of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries? This is the question we shall try to answer in the following pages..

Certain aspects of this question have already attracted the attention of students of Old French literature. A. Fourrier, for example, in his study of the realistic element in twelfth-century

---

(1) Coutumes de Beauvaisis, edited by A. Salmon, 2 vols (Paris 1899-1900), § 313.

romances, found that the two surviving works of Gautier d'Arras reflect the matrimonial law of the Merovingian period rather than that of Gautier's own time, but that this apparent anachronism can be explained by the survival of earlier customs in the actual practice of the twelfth century (2). He has also noted that Chrétien's Cligès presents a classic example of the "cas ... épineux ... de la sponsa ducrum", and outlined the canonical view which was probably prevalent when the romance was written. However, he concludes that Chrétien was not interested in this aspect of the affair, and that "ce qui le guide, ce n'est point le souci de la religion, c'est l'application des regulae amoris" (of Andreas Capellanus) (3). More recently, Fourrier has also used the canon law of marriage as valuable evidence for the dating of Chrétien's Lancelot (4).

The influence of canon law on Cligès is also touched on by P. Ménard in Le Rire et Le Sourire. He quotes canonical texts relating to the use of spells to prevent the consummation of a marriage, but concludes, like Fourrier, that Chrétien "ne s'inquiète pas de savoir si la conduite de Fenice et de Thessala est condamnée par le Droit canon" (5). For Professor Guiette, on the other hand, Cligès does indeed reflect certain complexities of matrimonial doctrine which Chrétien and his contemporaries could well have known about (6). Similar complexities could be

---

(2) Le Courant Réaliste dans le Roman Courtois en France au Moyen-Age (Paris 1960), pp.267-8 and 299-300.

(3) Op. cit. pp.176-7.

(4) "Retour au 'Terminus'", Mélanges Frappier, (Geneva 1970), vol.I, pp.299-311.

(5) Le Rire et le Sourire dans le Roman Courtois en France au Moyen-Age, 1150-1250 (Geneva 1969), p.271 and note 406.

(6) "Sur Quelques Vers de Cligès", Romania XCI (1970) pp.75-83.

seen by contemporaries in Bérout's Tristan, according to a recent article by Jean Subrenat (7). Unfortunately, M. Subrenat has drawn his information about canon law from Thomas Aquinas, who in fact presents a much later and more evolved legal system than that which was current in Bérout's day. Nevertheless, Subrenat's analysis is thought-provoking, and gives an idea of the rich possibilities of such comparisons between secular texts and canon law.

A particularly detailed examination of the relationship between canon law and theology on the one hand and a "courtly" text on the other is given by F. Schlösser in an illuminating article on Andreas Capellanus' De Amore (8). Schlösser shows that many of the arguments used by Andreas' characters in support of extra-marital love in fact reflect current theological views on marriage. Thus, the famous "Dicimus enim et stabilito tenore firmamus, amorem non posse suas inter duos iugales extendere vires" attributed to Marie de Champagne (9) is supported by the contemporary theological view of sexual love in marriage as no more than a duty (debitum) which husband and wife are bound to fulfil. This paradox explains the curious fact that "courtly love" was never explicitly condemned by the Church, and that the De Amore itself was not condemned until 1277. However, the laity in general probably knew nothing of the gulf between love and marriage which lay hidden in the works of St Augustine or Huguccio (Hugh of Pisa);

---

(7) J. Subrenat, "Le Climat Social, Moral, Religieux du Tristan de Bérout", Le Moyen Age LXXXII (1976) pp.219-261.

(8) "Die Minneauffassung des Andreas Capellanus und die zeitgenössische Ehelehre", Zeitschrift für Deutsche Philologie LXXIX (1960) pp.266-284.

(9) Andreas Capellanus, De Amore Libri Tres, edited by E. Trojel, second edition (Munich 1964), p.153; Schlösser, art. cit., pp.275-6.

the prevalent impression was, no doubt, that of the woman in Andreas' seventh dialogue, that "non videtur aliud esse amor nisi de aliquo habita immoderata carnalis dilectionis ambitio, quam nil inter coniugatos contradicit haberi." (10). In this respect, Schlösser thinks, lay people showed the theologians the way towards a more positive and humane view of marriage: "Lange vor den erfreulichen Bestrebungen der Hochscholastik, auch der natürlichen Gattenliebe einen relativen Wert zuzuerkennen, schon in Laienkreisen das Ideal einer geistgelenkten und dennoch geschlechtlich voll gelebten Ehe gegenwärtig war" (11). Moreover, the theological view of marriage was so one-sided in its insistence on spirituality and its rejection of sexual love that it did not in any way come under attack from the "courtly" code, which emphasised just that one aspect of the male-female relationship — sexual love — which the theologians regarded as being virtually extraneous to marriage. By a final paradox, it was the attempt of the lay nobility to rehabilitate sexual love in the form of extra-marital liaisons which paved the way to "einer erlaubten, personalen Gattenliebe, in der Eros und Gnade gleichermassen wirksam sind." (12).

Although some of Schlösser's conclusions, such as his statement that "Der Unvereinbarkeit von Ehe und Liebe im Bereich des Minnesangs kommt daher letztlich nur eine historisch bedingte, akzidentelle Bedeutung zu. Wer sie in den Mittelpunkt des höfischen Liebessystems stellen wollte, würde ihr Wesen verkennen" (p.283), may seem to need more proof than can be adduced in the

---

(10) De Amore, ed. cit., p.145; Schlösser, art. cit., p.277.

(11) Schlösser, art. cit., p.278.

(12) Ibid., p.283.



scope of an eighteen-page article, the work he has done nevertheless shows what rich new insights are to be gained from a comparison of secular and theological or canonical texts. Yet his, like the others mentioned above, is a comparatively brief study, and so far as I know there has not yet been a systematic attempt to compare the canon view of marriage with the marital attitudes depicted in a representative selection of appropriate Old French romances (13).

This is, perhaps, surprising, in view of the fact that, in 1968, Gabriel Le Bras made these theories readily available to mediaevalists in an article in the Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale, which sets out the canonical doctrine on marriage with great learning and clarity (14). I hope I may be forgiven if I here go over the ground already covered by M. Le Bras, both in this article and in his entry in the Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique under the heading "Mariage" (15); it seems to me desirable for the reader to have the basis of the Church views ready to hand, instead of being constantly referred to other sources. A re-statement will, moreover, allow us to pay particular attention to those aspects of canon law which most affect the romances.

---

(13) The topic is not even touched on in the recent book by R. H. Bloch, Mediaeval French Literature and Law (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1977). Students of mediaeval English and German literature seem to have paid more attention to the subject; see H. A. Kelly, Love and Marriage in the Age of Chaucer (Ithaca and London, 1975) and M. Schuhmacher, Die Auffassung der Ehe in den Dichtungen Wolframs von Eschenbach (Heidelberg, 1967).

(14) "Le Mariage dans la Théologie et le Droit de l'Eglise du XIe au XIIIe siècle", CCM XI (1968), pp.191-202.

(15) "La Doctrine du Mariage chez les théologiens et les canonistes depuis l'an mille", Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique edited by A. Vacant, (Paris 1899-1950), vol.IX, cols 2123-2317. (The initials DTC are generally used to refer to this dictionary in subsequent footnotes).

The principle that the Church alone was competent to judge matrimonial cases was probably fully enforced from the beginning of the eleventh century (16). However, the laws on which that judgment was to be made had yet to be determined, and they continued to be retouched and elaborated throughout the period with which we are concerned. Thus we are not dealing with an immutable body of laws, but with a legal system in the process of formation and evolution. The situation is further complicated by the fact that the episcopal courts had a considerable degree of independence, and appeals to the central authority of Rome were only made in the more hotly disputed cases. Judgments might therefore vary from one country to another, influenced by deep-rooted local custom or by the teachings of a nationally renowned canonist or theologian. Thus, during the second half of the twelfth century, the bishops in England seem to have laid considerably more emphasis than those elsewhere on the public celebration of marriage, while the French bishops adopted the theories of Peter Lombard well before they became incorporated into Papal practice (17). Our description of the development of matrimonial law in the Church will therefore have to take account of regional as well as historical variations.

---

(16) Le Bras, "La Doctrine du Mariage", DTC IX (1927), col.2123. This is a conservative dating; other authorities put the establishment of Church competence at the middle or end of the tenth century. See A. Esmein, Le Mariage en Droit Canonique, second edition, by R. Génestal and J. Dauvillier, 2 vols, (Paris 1935), vol.I, pp.27 ff; G. Lepointe, Droit Romain et Ancien Droit Français (Paris 1958), §359.  
 (17) The Gallican Church, made up of the nine provinces of Reims, Sens, Lyon, Bourges, Narbonne, Auch, Bordeaux, Tours and Rouen, transcended the political divisions of France at this period. See F. Lot and R. Fawtier, Histoire des Institutions Françaises au Moyen Age, vol.III, Institutions Ecclésiastiques, by J. -F. Lemarignier, J. Gaudemet and Mgr G. Mollat (Paris 1962), pp.160-187.

Bearing this in mind, we shall trace the Church's various laws on marriage from about 1150 to the end of the thirteenth century.

There are three main areas to be investigated: the establishment of the principle of indissolubility, the doctrine of the formation of marriage, and the possible dissolution of marriage, including the doctrine of nullity.

### I. The principle of indissolubility.

The Gospels insist on the indissolubility of marriage, and the Church had taught from its inception that a valid marriage was dissolved only by death. The only possible exception was that of the husband whose wife has committed adultery; the controversial texts of Matt. V 31-2 and XIX 9 seem to allow that such a man can legitimately repudiate his wife, and marry another woman (18). However, the main current of Church teaching had always maintained that the texts of Matt. XIX 3-8, Mark X 2-12 and Luke XVI 18 absolutely prohibited remarriage for either spouse during the lifetime of the other, and that, if the husband of an adulterous wife might be permitted to repudiate her, neither of them had any right to remarry while the other lived (19). This belief in absolute indissolubility was endorsed by St Augustine, and was the settled doctrine of the whole Church by the end of the ninth century.

This unanimity, however, was won slowly and with many setbacks. The Merovingian period, in particular, was one in which certain sections of the Church, influenced by the pre-Christian laws and customs of the laity, were ready to allow divorce and remarriage.

---

(18) The interpretation of these texts is still a problem; see R. Naz, Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique, vol.I (Paris 1924-35), s.v. "Adultère", cols 225-8; H. J. Richards, "Christ on Divorce", in Sacraments in Scripture, edited by T. Worden (London and Dublin 1966), pp.257-64.  
 (19) See Lepointe, op.cit., §285, and DTC vol.I, col.484.

This can clearly be seen from certain penitential books of the second half of the eighth century and from decisions given in the same period at the councils of Verberie (A.D.757) and Compiègne (A.D.758) (20).

In the case of adultery, there are penitential books which allow divorce and remarriage to the innocent partner, and the same freedom was also allowed at Verberie and at Compiègne, though restricted to cases where the adultery was committed with a near relation of the innocent spouse, and therefore took on an incestuous character through the link of affinity. Moreover, some particularly lax penitentials allowed even the guilty partner to remarry after undergoing a suitable penance (21). Thus divorce and remarriage for the victims of adultery, and even for the adulterers themselves, were apparently practised in the eighth century, even if the Church officially did not allow such proceedings.

Another frequent excuse for divorce in the Merovingian period was the entry of one spouse into a monastic order. As in the case of adultery, the Church did not, in theory, hold that this constituted a divorce; the marriage was indissoluble as long as both partners lived, and the non-religious spouse was not in any way free to enter into a new union. Instead, he or she was expected to make a vow of continence, or, better still, to enter a monastic order at the same time as his or her conjoint. Nevertheless, the

---

(20) The relevant passages are quoted by E. Magnin in his article on "Adultère" in the Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique, vol.I, cols 245-6. The initials DDC are generally used to refer to this dictionary in subsequent footnotes. On penitentials, see DDC vol.VI (Paris 1954-7), cols 1337-43.

(21) A. Vacant, "L'adultère et le lien du mariage", DTC vol.I, cols 484-5. This freedom for divorce was allowed partly because St Augustine had pointed out that remarriage was a lesser sin than the murder which the innocent spouse might otherwise commit. (DTC vol.IV, col.1467).

remarriage of the secular spouse seems to have been frequently allowed in practice (22). Nor was this abuse confined to the pre-Carolingian era; in the twelfth century, Pope Alexander III was still legislating in such cases (23).

Nor were these the only circumstances in which divorce was allowed in the eighth century: the councils of Verberie and Compiègne give several more cases in which one partner is authorised to remarry during the lifetime of the other. For the council of Compiègne, such circumstances were the leprosy of one conjoint, and the return to his own country of a man who had followed his lord to a foreign land and married there. Such a man could, if he wished, abandon his first wife and enter into a valid marriage with a woman in his own country (24). The council of Verberie was stricter; for example, it refused to admit that the entry of one conjoint into a monastery freed the other to make a new marriage (25). Yet its members, like those of Compiègne, bowed to the realities of feudalism by admitting remarriage for a man separated from his wife by feudal duty. The circumstances envisaged are slightly different from those given at Compiègne: it is supposed that the vassal is already married before leaving his country at the behest of his lord, or for some equally overriding reason (flight from private vengeance is not admitted), and that his wife refuses to accompany him.

---

(22) A. Esmein, Le Mariage en Droit Canonique, second edition, edited by R. Génestal and J. Dauvillier, 2 vols (Paris 1935), vol.II, pp.25-7.

(23) J. Dauvillier, Le Mariage dans le Droit Classique de l'Eglise depuis le Decret de Gratien (Paris 1933), pp.315-8.

(24) A. Villien, "La Pratique du Divorce aux Temps Mérovingiens et Carolingiens", DTC vol.IV, cols 1464-9.

(25) Lepointe, op. cit., §209.

Under such conditions, he may marry again in the country to which he has been forced to emigrate, provided that he does public penance. Moreover, a man was allowed to divorce his wife and marry again if he could prove that she had plotted his death (26). In addition, both at Verberie and at Compiègne, impotence was considered to give valid grounds for divorce (27).

The penitentials, as well as the councils, admitted other grounds for divorce besides adultery. Among these were impotence, desertion by the wife, or the long captivity of either partner (28).

Such departures of churchmen from the doctrine of strict indissolubility were, it seems, particularly rife in the Anglo-Saxon and Frankish areas, in comparison with the stricter discipline of the Irish or the Lombards (29).

Nevertheless, it must be remembered that this "tolérance pour les mœurs de populations mal imprégnées encore de l'esprit chrétien" sprang only from temporary and local weaknesses in the Church (30). Such abuses as the remarriage of a man whose wife has committed adultery or taken the veil were denounced by "official" Church doctrine. The penitentials which condoned these practices, though written by and for churchmen, were private documents for the use of confessors rather than public statements of doctrine, and were condemned during the Carolingian reform (31).

(26) DTC vol.IV, col.1465.

(27) J. Dauvillier, op. cit., p.175.

(28) As well as the article in DTC on "Divorce" already referred to, see Lepointe, op. cit., §287.

(29) There is some disagreement on this point; A. Vacant and A. Villien (DTC vol.I col.496 and vol.IV col.1164) consider that the Franks were mainly influenced by the lax penitential attributed to St Theodore of Canterbury, but G. Lepointe (op. cit., §287) thinks that Irish influence was also strong.

(30) A. Vacant, DTC I col.484.

(31) DDC, vol.I, col.246.

The decisions given at Verberie and Compiègne may have appeared to emanate from regular Church councils, and were indeed assumed to do so by later canonists; but both assemblies were in fact dominated by powerful laymen, and the bishops present did not officially approve the clauses allowing divorce (32). This mainstream of Church opinion, which had always been firmly opposed to divorce, definitely overcame the sort of dissident views we have been describing towards the end of the ninth century (33), and by the middle of the twelfth century "la doctrine sur le divorce est définitivement fixée dans Gratien et Pierre Lombard, qui tous deux sont d'accord": neither adultery, leprosy, captivity, prolonged absence nor monastic vows dissolved the marriage or gave the other conjoint freedom to remarry (34).

Yet there were some hesitations even at this period. Both Gratien and Peter Lombard seem to allow divorce if one partner becomes a slave and the other remains free, and the Lombard, curiously enough, upholds the Verberie decision allowing remarriage to the exile whose wife has refused to accompany him. Neither of these exceptions, however, was incorporated into the more fully developed canon law of the later twelfth century.

Of course, it was one thing to hold this rigorous doctrine, and another to enforce it. The Church could not properly impose her beliefs in practice until she had established her right to

---

(32) <sup>vol.</sup> DTC, I, cols 490-91.  
 (33) Lepointe, op. cit., §290.  
 (34) Ibid, §396.

exclusive jurisdiction in matrimonial questions, and this, as we have seen, was not achieved until the late tenth or early eleventh century. The principle of indissolubility was thenceforward applied more and more firmly, but as Fourrier has shown, divorce still occurred even in the second half of the twelfth century (35). Nevertheless, it is fair to say that the majority of Old French romances were written at a time when the absolute indissolubility of all valid marriages was accepted in principle by all churchmen and - with some exceptions - by laymen as well, and was largely followed in practice.

## II. The Making of the Marriage-Bond

Some of the major canonical and theological debates of the twelfth century centred around the question of exactly what constituted the bond of marriage. In order to understand some of the difficulties this problem presented, we must first examine the contemporary idea of betrothal, which differed considerably from our modern notions of engagement.

### a) Betrothal

For the Church in the first half of the twelfth century, betrothal vows were almost as binding as full marriage vows:

---

(35) Le Courant Réaliste pp.299-300. See also Dauvillier, op. cit. p.238, on cases of divorce and remarriage after the religious profession of one conjoint.



"Les fiançailles du droit canonique étaient très énergiques dans leurs effets, et l'on peut soutenir qu'en principe elles étaient, une fois contractées, indissolubles" (36). Indeed, Ivo of Chartres, writing at the end of the eleventh century, had openly maintained that two people united by betrothal were legally incapable of marrying anyone but each other (37). This extreme view, which in effect made a marriage redundant once a betrothal had been celebrated, did not win general acceptance; nevertheless, the Church continued to regard betrothal as being an initial stage in the formation of the indissoluble marriage-bond. The laity largely shared this view of the solemnity of betrothal, for, as Esmein points out, at this period "un mariage est une alliance entre deux familles, plus encore qu'une union entre deux personnes: cette alliance est nécessairement délibérée à l'avance et arrêtée par un traité préalable, qui n'est autre chose que les fiançailles" (38).

This state of affairs, in which the effects of betrothal were very close to those of marriage, can be seen as part of a general confusion between marriage and betrothal which had already arisen in the early Church. At once a symptom and a cause of this confusion is the duplication or interchange of certain rites which had originally distinguished the two ceremonies. Thus, the Roman custom of veiling the bride was originally a betrothal custom, according to Tertullian (39); the ring given by a man to his fiancée

---

(36) A. Esmein, Le Mariage en Droit Canonique, second edition by R. Génestal and J. Dauvillier (Paris 1935), vol.I, p.182.

(37) R. Naz, Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique, vol.5 (Paris 1953), s.v. "Fiançailles", col.840.

(38) A. Esmein, op. cit., vol.I, p.107.

(39) W. Smith and S. Cheetham, Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, 2 vols (London 1875-80), s.v. "Marriage", vol.II, p.1106.

in ancient Rome became a wedding ring in ninth-century France (40); and other rites, such as the joining of hands and even the blessing by a priest, were used at both marriage and betrothal from about the fourth century onwards (41). The same confusion existed in terminology as in ritual, for the terms desponsatio, sponsus, sponsa and sponsalia could apply to either ceremony (42). Finally, both occasions consisted essentially in a mutual promise of marriage.

All these similarities between betrothal and marriage, and the confusion to which they gave rise, must be borne in mind as we turn to examine the different arguments about the way in which the marriage-bond was formed.

b) The Consensus/Copula debate

i) Before Gratian.

As we have seen, the Church had always tried - though with varying success - to make the faithful live up to the rule that marriage was indissoluble. By the twelfth century, however, the difficulty of enforcing this law had been increased by a theoretical uncertainty about marriage itself: what exactly is it that creates the indissoluble bond, and makes a man and a woman one flesh, henceforth an indivisible unit in God's eyes? For Hincmar of Reims in the second half of the ninth century, "le mariage ne devient vraiment indissoluble que lorsque, consommé

---

(40) E. Chénon, "Recherches Historiques sur quelques Rites Nuptiaux", Nouvelle Revue Historique de Droit Français et Etranger XXXVI (1912), pp.574-85 and 605-6.

(41) Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, loc. cit.; Chénon, art. cit., pp.597-600.

(42) For examples of this confusion, see Esmein, op. cit., pp.112-3; Chénon, art. cit., p.585; J. Dauvillier, Le Mariage dans le Droit Classique de l'Eglise (Paris 1933), p.56.

par la copula carnalis, il représente véritablement l'union du Christ qui s'est fait chair pour s'unir à l'Eglise" (43). This emphasis on consummation as the decisive moment in the formation of the bond was supported by the "erunt duo in carne una" of Gen.II.24, Matt.XIX.5 and Mark X.8, and was influenced by the general custom and viewpoint of the times (44). It provided a convenient way of distinguishing between the married couple and the betrothed couple, and also enhanced the value of marriage as a remedy for man's lust, by encumbering the fulfilment of lust with the binding consequences of marriage.

Nevertheless, the prominence thus given to the physical side of marriage was distasteful to many churchmen, and in the middle of the eleventh century Damian argued strongly against the view that marriage was formed by the copula carnalis (45). Successive popes were already feeling their way towards a view that marriage was created by the agreement of the two conjoints when the rediscovery of Roman laws towards the end of the eleventh century brought to light the Justinian formula: consensus facit nuptias (46). This lent great support to the argument that the deciding factor was the agreement of the couple to live together as husband and wife, and provided a much-needed counterpoise to the idea that marriage was not binding until it had been physically consummated. However, the new emphasis on the consensus created difficulties of its own, one of which was an aggravation of

---

(43) Esmein, op. cit., vol.I, p.70.

(44) Lepointe, op. cit., §363.

(45) DTC IX col.2132.

(46) DTC IX cols.2124-5.

the confusion between betrothal and marriage. On both of these occasions, as we have pointed out, the couple expressed their agreement to their marriage: which, then, was the one agreement which created the indissoluble bond? A second difficulty was that of exactly whose consent made the marriage: was the agreement of the couple themselves sufficient, or was their marriage invalid unless their families had also agreed? A third difficulty arose when it was recognised that parental agreement was not necessary, and that the one essential element was the agreement of the couple concerned. Even if the only witnesses to it were the husband and wife, the Church had to allow that such an agreement made a valid marriage, and the difficulties created by such clandestine unions were not overcome until the Council of Trent.

Thus, at the time when the first romances were probably written, the relative importance of consent and consummation in forming marriage had not yet been settled, and the full implications of consensualism itself had yet to be worked out. The second half of the twelfth century was a period of debate, dominated by two major figures: the canonist Gratian, whose Decretum had appeared in or near 1140 (47), and the theologian Peter Lombard, whose Sententiae probably date from 1152 (48).

---

(47) This is the traditional dating of the Decretum. However, there has been some dispute on the question; see J. Gaudemet, J.-F. Lemarignier and Mgr G. Mollat, Institutions Ecclésiastiques (Paris 1962), p.143 n.(1).

(48) Le Bras, "Le Mariage", CCM XI p.192 n.14; J. Dauvillier, Le Mariage dans le Droit Classique de l'Eglise (Paris 1933), p.12. Lepointe, op. cit. §370, gives the date 1150 for the Sententiae.

11) From Gratian to c.1300.

The test case, in the consensus/copula debate, was that of the sponsa duorum to which we have already referred (49). A man and a woman exchange vows of marriage, but do not consummate their match; later, the woman gives the same promise to a different man, and this second consensus is followed by the copula carnalis. To whom is she legally married? Does the simple consensus of the first match give rise to an indissoluble union, thus nullifying the second match? Or is indissolubility only realised by physical union, giving the second match full validity?

Gratian held that the simple expression of agreement in marriage or betrothal vows, for both of which he used the term desponsatio, did not make a fully valid marriage, but only a matrimonium initiatum. This beginning of a marriage was completed by the establishment of sexual relations between the couple, which transformed their union into a matrimonium ratum, dissolvable only by death (50). An earlier desponsatio, therefore, had to give way to a later desponsatio which had been followed by consummation, and the case of the sponsa duorum was resolved in favour of the second husband. The introduction of the category of Matrimonium initiatum was a way of reconciling the new theory of consensus facit nuptias with the old idea that marriage was made by the physical bond of unitas carnis, and thus producing a "con<sup>d</sup>corance of the discordant canons" (51) in the matter of matrimony.

---

(49) Above, p.49.

(50) Dauvillier, op. cit., pp.10-11. DTC IX cols 2149-50; Lepointe, Droit Romain et Ancien Droit Français (Paris 1958), §368.

(51) This may have been the title Gratian himself gave his Decretum. See C. Herbermann et al., Catholic Encyclopedia (New York 1907-22), s.v. "Gratian, Johannes".

Gratian also limited the effect of the consensus by insisting on the necessity of parental consent to ratify that of the betrothed or married couple (52).

Gratian's ideas were far from being universally adopted, though they affected the Italian and English Churches and influenced other canonists, including Rolandus Bandinelli, the future Pope Alexander III (53). The popes of the 1140s and 50s, however, affirmed the validity of the consensus alone, without the copula, and maintained that an earlier desponsatio always nullified any subsequent one, even where the first promise might have been nearer to a betrothal than a marriage (54). Thus the case of the sponsa duorum might have been solved in two different ways in the middle of the twelfth century, depending on the locality in which it was judged or the level at which the judgment was given.

Peter Lombard put forward a radically consensualist view, opposed to that of Gratian. He began by making a clear distinction between betrothal and marriage, pointing out that marriage-vows take effect in the present, while betrothal vows are given for the future. His clear terminology - sponsalia de praesenti, sponsalia de futuro - did much to untangle the confusion between the two. He taught that only the sponsalia de praesenti create the bond of marriage; and that if freely expressed by two people who are not prevented from marrying

---

(52) Le Bras, DTC IX col.2151.

(53) R. Naz, Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique vol.IV, cols 370-371.

(54) Dauvillier, op. cit., pp.13-14.

each other by any legal impediment, these sponsalia are all that is needed. Neither parental consent nor consummation can affect the validity of the marriage contracted per verba de praesenti; even the blessing of a priest may be dispensed with, for it is not of the substance of the sacrament (55).

Thus Peter Lombard took the dictum that consensus facit nuptias to its logical conclusion, and asserted that consent alone made a marriage sacramental, and hence indissoluble (56). The full consequences of his teaching were gradually accepted by the French church in the second half of the twelfth century (57). Meanwhile, Alexander III, who became Pope in 1159, gradually modified the papal position and built up, over the twenty-two years of his pontificate, "un système unique, cohérent et fortement charpenté" by which matrimonial cases were to be judged (58).

At first, Alexander followed the practice of his predecessors, making no clear distinction between marriage-vows and betrothal-vows, and affirming that any sponsalia constituted

(55) Le Bras, "Le Mariage dans la Théologie et le Droit", CCM XI (1968) pp.198-9; Lepointe, op. cit., §370.

(56) R. Naz, Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique, vol.IV, col.370.

(57) The Lombard's reduction of the status of betrothal to something like our modern engagement was slow in being accepted. See Fourrier, "Retour au 'Terminus'", Mélanges Frappier vol.I, pp.306 and 309 n.58.

(58) Dauvillier, op. cit., p.5. Dauvillier thus disagrees with Le Bras, in whose DTC article, which appeared 6 years before Dauvillier's book, Alexander's policies are described as hesitant. (vol.IX, col.2157).

a valid marriage which nullified any subsequent marital agreement, even in cases where the first sponsalia were not consummated and the second were (59). On other occasions, however, Alexander III gave a different answer to this classic problem. In cases where one of the two marriages had been solemnised by a priest, and the other had been made without a Church celebration, he declared the Church marriage valid even if the "civil" one had preceded it. Dauvillier considers that these decisions form a coherent stage in the development of Alexander III's thought, and mark him out as an extremely advanced canonist who was already, in the early 1170s, experimenting with what was to be the Tridentine idea that clandestinity nullifies a marriage (60). However, all but one of the texts quoted by Dauvillier are undated, and some of them are unclear; one must therefore deal circumspectly with Dauvillier's conclusion that, between c.1173/4 and c.1176, Alexander III formulated and then abandoned a "théorie solennelle."

There seems rather more reason to agree with Dauvillier on the dating of the influence of Peter Lombard on Alexander's views. It seems likely that it was either during or shortly after his stay in France in 1162-5, that Alexander III adopted the Lombard's distinction between consensus de praesenti and consensus de futuro. He was thus able to rationalise his earlier insistence on the validity of sponsalia. Consent alone still made the marriage, "matrimonium autem solo consensu contrahitur" (61); but the

---

(59) Dauvillier, op. cit., pp.18-19.

(60) Ibid. pp.23-8.

(61) Ibid., pp.29-30.



confusion between betrothal and matrimony was eliminated, and a couple were no longer held to be bound in marriage when they had only promised to marry each other in the future.

Betrothal vows, however, had considerably more force in the system of Alexander III than they did in that of Peter Lombard. Alexander regarded the sponsalia as a genuine marital agreement, which, though made de futuro, could take effect de praesenti in certain circumstances. This was the theory of the matrimonium per copula sponsalibus superveniens, which appears to have been thought out by Alexander some time between 1163 and 1179. It was a fusion of the theories of Gratian with those of Peter Lombard, and was useful in preventing abuse of the doctrine that the consensus only gave rise to the bond of marriage when expressed in the present. Remembering Gratian's description of the consummated marriage as a matrimonium ratum, Alexander declared that, if a couple who had given their consensus de futuro went on to establish full conjugal relations before they had given a consensus de praesenti, they thereby entered into a matrimonium ratum et consummatum. The agreement made for the future was fulfilled, the couple had become one flesh; there was no need for any further consensus to bring their marriage into being, and the impatient pair were indissolubly bound together (62).

Alexander made another departure from Peter Lombard's system, by admitting that a marriage made by consent but not consummated could, in certain circumstances, be dissolved.

---

(62) Ibid., pp.33-39.

The circumstances which gave grounds for such dissolution were the religious profession of one conjoint, or sexual relations between one conjoint and a relation of the other. However, these were the only two conditions which dissolved an unconsummated marriage, and in all other respects Alexander followed the Lombard's teaching that an unconsummated marriage was a sacramental, indissoluble union (Dauvillier, pp.52-3).

Thus Alexander did not adopt a purely consensual view. Basically, he followed Peter Lombard's teaching that marriage was made by the mutual agreement of a man and a woman to accept each other as husband and wife, and was valid even if it was clandestine, unconsummated and opposed by the couple's parents. The agreement must, however, be expressed in the present, and is distinct from betrothal, which is an agreement to become husband and wife at some time in the future. However, Alexander modified the Lombard's system in three ways. He was inclined in some cases to attach importance to the public celebration of marriage as a criterion of validity; he developed from Gratian the doctrine of the marriage by copula sponsalibus superveniens, which declared that betrothal is transformed into marriage if it is followed by copulation; and he did not maintain the absolute indissolubility of the unconsummated matrimonium per verba de praesenti.

Dauvillier assigns these different tendencies to different periods of Alexander's pontificate, concluding that, by 1179, he had formed a coherent system under which marriage could be formed in either of two clearly-defined ways: by consensus per verba

de praesenti, or by consensus de futuro followed by copula carnalis (63).

The popes who succeeded Alexander III did little to alter the pattern he had established. They did not reintroduce the idea that a clandestine marriage was invalid; they held fast to the principle that consensus facit nuptias; and, by a change in terminology, they incorporated the matrimonium per copula sponsalibus superveniens more neatly into a wholly consensualist framework.

This change was apparently the work of the canonist Huguccio, who, in his Summa of c.1187-90, first put forward the theory that, at the moment of the copula, a betrothed couple were expressing their consensus de praesenti, and that it was this presumed agreement, and not the copula, which made their marriage. Huguccio thus kept Alexander III's idea that sexual relations between a betrothed couple transformed their betrothal into marriage, but avoided the awkwardness of having to admit that, in such cases, the copula itself was an important element in the formation of the marriage-bond. Marriage by copula sponsalibus superveniens, transformed by Huguccio into a marriage by presumed agreement (matrimonium praesumptum), could now be integrated into a system which declared that the one and only way in which marriage could be contracted was by consensus de praesenti. Pope Innocent III took up this idea in a decision

---

(63) The development of Alexander III's doctrine is summarised by Dauvillier, op. cit., pp.51-4.

given in 1211, and it was definitively adopted into papal practice by Gregory IX (1227-1241), who upheld the validity of a matrimonium praesumptum even when it had been followed by a consummated Church marriage with a third party. From then on, the doctrine that marriage was formed by the occurrence of copula carnalis following betrothal vows was incorporated into canon law, and accepted by the local church courts who administered it. There were shifts of emphasis; theologians argued against the idea that copulation necessarily expressed a perfect marital consent, and some decretalists preferred to see the consensus as being expressed by the verba de futuro, and simply ratified by the copula. But, whatever theory was favoured to account for the situation, the fact that the combination of betrothal and copulation, in that order, created a valid marriage, remained an article of canon law throughout the period with which we are concerned (64).

The doctrine of the matrimonium praesumptum reinforced the solidity of the consensualist system. In the same spirit, Alexander III's successors restricted the dissolution of an unconsummated marriage to one case only, that of the religious vocation taken up by either partner.

---

(64) On the doctrine of Alexander III's successors, see Dauvillier, op. cit., pp.55-66.

Thus the consensus/copula debate was settled in favour of consent. The doctrine that consensus facit nuptias had been enforced by Popes from Innocent II (1130-43) onwards, but in their insistence that marriage was made by consent and not by consummation they had failed to distinguish between marriage and betrothal. It was not until Peter Lombard had clarified this difference that consensualism became a logical, flexible and above all practicable system. The Lombard's ideas won acceptance in the Gallican church early in the second half of the twelfth century, but the bishops of northern Italy were meanwhile enforcing Gratian's principles. However, Peter Lombard's arguments convinced Alexander III, who established the distinction between verba de futuro and verba de praesenti as a key element in matrimonial legislation. This penetration of the Lombard's views into the whole Church probably began in the 1160s, when Alexander III was in France. However, betrothal vows, which for Peter Lombard had been quite distinct from marriage vows, became in Alexander III's system a form of provisional marriage vow which could be made absolute by the intervention of the copula; and the unconsummated marriage was not absolutely indissoluble in practice, as it had been in the Lombard's theory.

The consent which was thus declared to be the efficient cause of marriage was the free, present consent of the consorts themselves. Provided that no impediment existed, such consent was all that was needed for the formation of a valid marriage.

No set formula was prescribed, although Alexander III suggested the words "ego te recipio in meum, ego te recipio in meam" (65). Dauvillier, however, thinks that this formula was given simply as an example, not as a rule, and certainly any other clear expression of consent, whether verbal or not, was accepted; the dumb, for instance, were not debarred from the sacrament of marriage by their inability to pronounce any form of verba de praesenti (66). Parental consent and church celebration could also be dispensed with, and a couple could, if they wished, become man and wife simply by expressing their consent to each other. The full validity of a marriage made in this way is declared by Alexander III in a letter to the bishop of Norwich : "Si ... vir et mulier ipsa, de praesenti se receperint, dicendo unus alteri, ego te recipio in meam, et ego te accipio in meum, etiamsi non intervenit illa solemnitas nec vir mulierem carnaliter cognoverit ... non poterit nec debuerit post talem consensum alii nubere" (67). The Church regarded such clandestine marriages

---

(65) Ibid., pp.21 and 30-31. These words are echoed in the Constitutiones Richardi episcopi Sarum anno 1217 quoted by E.Martène in De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus, 2 vols (Antwerp 1736-8), vol.2, lib.I, cap.IX, art.III, tit.VI: "Item praecipimus quod sacerdotes doceant personas contrahentes hanc formam verborum in Gallico vel in Anglico: Ego N. accipio te in meam. Similiter & mulier dicat: Ego accipio te in meum. In his enim verbis consistit vis magna & matrimonium contrahitur".

(66) See Le Bras, art. cit., DTC vol.IX, col.2161, and the decretal of Innocent III in Corpus Juris Canonici, edited by E.L.Richter and S.Friedberg, 2 vols (Leipzig 1879-81), vol.II, lib.IV, tit.I, cap.XXV. There is considerable variety in the forms of words used in the wedding services recorded by Martène, op. cit., vol.II, cols 353-87.

(67) Quoted by Dauvillier, op. cit., p.30. See also L.Beauchet, "Etude Historique sur les Formes de la Célébration du Mariage dans l'ancien droit français", Nouvelle Revue Historique de Droit Français et Etranger, third series, vol.VI (1882), pp.387-8.

with disfavour and imposed penances on those who contracted them, but she could not disallow their validity. The same freedom from formality applied to betrothal, which could also be validly entered into without any witnesses being present; such clandestine betrothals, which could be transformed into marriages by copulation, were severely frowned on by the Church, although the validity of marriages contracted in this way was firmly upheld (68).

In short, the twelfth century saw the gradual establishment of the principle that, once a couple had freely expressed their desire to live henceforward as husband and wife, they had contracted an indissoluble union. By the thirteenth century, only death or monastic vows could dissolve the bond thus verbally created, and the only effect of the subsequent consummation of the marriage was to remove the second of these two possible causes of dissolution. Equally, non-consummation did not of itself affect the validity of a marriage; as Fourrier points out in connexion with Cligès, it would be false to believe that Fenice's marriage was null because it was unconsummated (69). Provided it had been made by a true consent, the non-consummated marriage was a fully valid and indissoluble union, modelled after the pattern set by St Joseph and the Virgin Mary (70). Only if it was the result of certain kinds of impotence would non-consummation nullify a marriage, and in such cases it was the impotence, and not the non-consummation, which created the nullity (71).

---

(68) Dauvillier, op. cit., pp.61-2.

(69) Le Courant Réaliste, p.176.

(70) Lepointe, op. cit., §§ 370, 372.

(71) See below, pp.108ff (Si coire nequibis).

### III. The diriment impediments

Between the sixth and the twelfth centuries, there gradually grew up in the Church the idea that, in certain conditions, a union which appeared to be a marriage might violate natural or divine law so seriously as to be no marriage at all (72). A bigamous union, for example, could not be a marriage, for marriage was defined by the Bible as the union of one man and one woman exclusively, and no subsequent liaison of a married person during the lifetime of his or her spouse could be anything other than a sinful concubinage. Even if, through some error, the bigamous couple had been formally wedded in church, their relationship was still not a marriage, and could never be considered as such as long as the bigamist's true spouse was alive (73).

It was during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries that the theory of the nullity of such marriages was fully developed, providing the necessary means of reconciling the principle of indissolubility with the need to dissolve illegal marriages. By declaring that a bigamous or incestuous couple, for example, had been legally incapable of marrying each other in the first place, the Church was able to separate such couples without altering the definition of marriage as an indissoluble union. Bigamy and incest were, indeed, according to Ivo of Chartres, the two original impediments, but by the twelfth century many others had been added to the list, and yet more were developed in the course of the period we are concerned with. Moreover,

---

(72) A. Bride, "Les Empêchements de Mariage", DDC vol.V (1950-53), cols 368-71.

(73) Nor, indeed, would such a union be a marriage after the death of the legitimate spouse, for it would then incur the impediment of crimen; see below pp. 82-4.



the term "impediment" was also used to describe lesser illegalities which, though grave enough to be punishable by heavy penances, did not actually nullify the contract of marriage; clandestinity, for example, was one of these "prohibitive" impediments (74). We shall here deal only with the "diriment" impediments, which lead to nullity, since they are the only ones whose legal effects are significantly reflected in the romances.

In his *Summa* of c.1253, Hostiensis (Henry of Segusio) listed the impediments then operative in the convenient form of the following mnemonic verse (75):

Error, conditio, votum, cognatio, crimen,  
Cultus disparitas, vis, ordo, ligamen, honestas,  
Dissensus, et affinis, si forte coire nequibis,  
Haec facienda vetant connubia, facta retractant.

We shall take these thirteen cases in the order given by Hostiensis, and trace their development during the period which interests us, including the parallel development of the papal dispensations which could be granted from many of them.

---

(74) The terms "prohibitive" and "diriment" were first used to distinguish the two sorts of impediment by Bernard of Pavia in his *Summa de Matrimonio* which appeared between 1170 and 1198.  
(75) There were several of these mnemonics; Hostiensis' version is often quoted, for example by Esmein, *op. cit.*, vol.I, p.235, n.3, and by A. Bride, "Les Empêchements de Mariage", *DDC* vol.V, col.274.

1) Error.

Gratian and Peter Lombard examined four possible errors which might dirimate a marriage, and concluded that neither an error fortunae nor an error qualitatis had such a radical effect. An error circa personam, on the other hand, did indeed nullify any marriage in which one partner had mistaken the identity of the other (76).

A letter of Innocent III (1198-1216) gives some interesting information on the error personae. In the case of a young man who deceived a girl by marrying her under the assumed name of "Iohannes", Innocent ruled that there was no question of mistaken identity, since "Iohannes" had promised marriage in propria persona, and the girl knew whom she was marrying, even if she was mistaken about his name. Yet "Iohannes" believed that his use of a false name would invalidate his marriage, "non credens esse coniugium eo, quod ipse non vocaretur hoc nomine" (77). This suggests that the use of the correct name was commonly regarded as an essential element in the marriage ritual, no doubt because it minimised the chances of error personae occurring. It is noticeable that nearly all the wedding and betrothal ceremonies recorded by Martène indicate that the couple should use each other's names, and that in many cases the priest opens the ceremony by enquiring what their names are (78).

---

(76) Lepointe, op. cit., §380; DDC vol.V, cols 272-3.

(77) Corpus Juris Canonici, vol.II, lib.IV., tit.I, cap.26. The case is also commented on in Li Livres de Jostice et de Plet, edited by P.N.Rapetti (Paris 1850), (Collection de Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France, no. 78), book X, tit.I, §26. The marriage was in fact null through lack of consent: see below, p.<sup>102</sup>.

(78) Op. cit., vol.II, Lib.I, Cap.IX, Art.V. See especially Ordo IX (Amiens), Ordo XII (Limoges), and Ordo XIII (Reims).

ii) Conditio.

The fourth kind of error examined by Gratian and Peter Lombard was that of error conditionis - the mistaken belief that a slave is a free person. Marriages between slave and free had been forbidden both in Roman law and in the law of the Wisigoths, but, by the mid-twelfth century, such discrimination had been limited to cases in which, through a genuine error, a person lost his or her own freedom by marrying a slave (79). Such a marriage would be declared null unless the free partner, on discovering his mistake, showed his agreement to the union by remaining with his conjoint in the state of slavery. According to Lepointe, this impediment generally applied only to slaves and not to serfs (80); however, the fact that the subject is treated in Jostice et Plet under the heading "Dou Mariage as Sers" suggests that such was not always the case (81). The impediment certainly did not apply to any rank above that of serf; there was no question, for example, of annulling a marriage between a noble and a commoner on the grounds that one had been mistaken as to the other's condition. Such a mistake would simply be an error fortunæ vel qualitatis.

---

(79) Lepointe, op. cit., §381.

(80) Loc. cit.

(81) Jostice et Plet, book X, tit.IX.

iii) Votum.

The view that the marriage of virgins consecrated to God was scandalous was widely held by Frankish times, though the Church did not officially declare such marriages null until the Tridentine period (82). Hugh of Saint-Victor (d. 1142) saw the solemn vow of perpetual chastity as a diriment impediment to marriage (83), but it should be noted that such vows were rare. Even the vow of chastity taken by religious was not recognised as solemn until the thirteenth century (84), and it was only the solemn vow which, by its commitment of the whole person of the votary, nullified any subsequent attempt at marriage (85). A simple vow of chastity made by a layman was a prohibitive impediment to marriage, and the Church could therefore impose penances on people who married in spite of having made such a vow; the marriage, however, was perfectly valid (86). This rule is clearly enunciated in a decision of Pope Celestine III (1181-98) quoted by Jostice et Plet : "Un voa chastée par simples paroles, et jura enprès que il l'aposerait une feme : l'en demande qu'en dit droiz? Que il gart son vou, et qu'il face sa pénitence do serement; et s'il se marie, le mariage tient; car simple vou empeeche mariage à fere, mès il ne la dépièce pas" (87).

---

(82) DDC vol.V cols 269-70.

(83) P. Séjourné, "Voeu", DTC vol.XV, col.3197.

(84) R. Naz, "Les Voeux dans l'ancien droit français", DDC vol.VII (1965) col.1624.

(85) On the distinction between simple and solemn vows, see Herbermann et al., The Catholic Encyclopedia (New York 1907-22), vol.XV, pp.512-3.

(86) DDC s.v. "Empêchements", vol.V col.273.

(87) Jostice et Plet book X, tit.VI, §6.

iv) Cognatio.

The impediment of consanguinity was extremely far-reaching in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. In the eighth or ninth century, the Church had changed from the Roman system of calculating degrees of consanguinity by counting up to the common ancestor and down again, to the Germanic system of counting by generations. Marriage was already forbidden up to the seventh degree of Roman computation (second cousins), and the Church retained the limit of seven degrees when it adopted the Germanic method. Since each Germanic degree corresponded to two Roman degrees, the result was the extension of the prohibition to the thirteenth and fourteenth degrees (sixth cousins) (88). Such a system was unworkable : "On n'aurait guère trouvé de mariage dont la validité n'aurait pu être contestée du chef de la violation de l'empêchement de consanguinité" (89). Dispensations were very easily accorded for marriages beyond the fourth degree (the equivalent of the old Roman seventh degree) (90), and this tended to bring the Church's laws into disrepute. More seriously, those who wished to have their marriage annulled could almost always show that they were related within the forbidden degrees; it will be remembered that Louis VII and Eleanor of Aquitaine were separated in just such a way. In order to check such abuses, the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215

---

(88) G. Oesterlé, "Consanguinité", DDC vol.IV (1944-9), cols 234-6. The Roman and Germanic systems are nowadays known respectively as the civil and canonical methods of computation.

(89) Ibid., col.236.

(90) In the twelfth century, bishops could grant dispensations; there was no need to apply to the Pope. See Dauvillier, op.cit., pp.201 and 204.

restricted the impediment to the fourth degree, thus returning to the original Roman limit (91).

After 1215, then, it became more difficult to have one's marriage annulled on the grounds of consanguinity. Equally, papal dispensations allowing people to marry within the forbidden degrees were, at first, far more rarely accorded (92). Honorius III (1216-1227) and Gregory IX (1227-41) granted very few such dispensations. With Innocent IV (1243-54), however, a new laxity appeared; he granted no less than 210 dispensations from various impediments, of which 112 were from the fourth degree of consanguinity. This liberal granting of dispensations prevailed until the end of the thirteenth century, and included even some dispensations for marriages in the third degree (first cousins) (93).

The impediment of cognatio did not only apply to blood relationships; it extended also to spiritual relationships resulting from participation in the sacraments - for example, the relationship between godparents and godchildren. Since the time of Justinian, marriages between godparent and godchild had been forbidden; in the twelfth century, the prohibition was extended to their immediate relatives. A child could not marry the spouse of his godparent, nor could his parents marry his godparents or their widowed spouses. This problem arose with enough frequency for Gratian to comment on the difficulty of enforcing the impediment (94).

---

(91) DDC, s.v. "Consanguinité", vol.IV, col.236.

(92) Only the Pope could grant dispensations at this period.

(93) Dauvillier, op. cit., pp.201-212.

(94) On this topic, see DDC s.v. "Cognatio Spiritualis", vol.III (1938-42), cols.952-9.

Even more common, one imagines, must have been the case of couples prevented from marrying by spiritual fraternity, the relationship "entre les fils charnels - nés avant ou après la participation aux sacrements - du baptisant, du confirmant ou du parrain et leurs fils spirituels, à savoir le baptisé ou le confirmé" (95). Marriages between people "related" in this way were null, and Gratian criticised <sup>those</sup> who arranged such marriages most severely.

v) Crimen.

Under certain circumstances, the marriage of a couple who had committed adultery together was null. This impediment was mainly designed to frustrate any attempt by the adulterous couple to marry by plotting the deaths of their legal conjoints, and nullity was pronounced in such circumstances by Alexander III in the second half of the twelfth century (96). However, Alexander also applied the impediment in another case, "qui a été posé pour la première fois par le concile de Tribur de 895, [et qui] se produit quand, du vivant de la première femme, un individu en connaît une autre, et contracte avec elle un mariage de facto ou lui donne sa foi de l'épouser" (97). Thus, for Alexander III, simple adultery was not a serious enough crime to constitute a diriment impediment; it had to be complicated by a desire to break up the existing marriage, and this desire could

---

(95) DDC vol.III, cols.958-9.

(96) Msmein, op. cit., vol.I, pp.428-31; Dauvillier, op.cit., p.158.

(97) Dauvillier, op. cit., p.159.

be seen to exist in cases where there was an attempt on the life of the legal conjoint, or where the adulterous couple had planned, or even realised, their own marriage. It was in this form (adultery combined with an attack on the existing marriage) that the impediment was adopted by the popes who succeeded Alexander III (98), and incorporated by Gregory IX into the decretals of the Corpus Juris Canonici (99).

However, at an earlier period of church legislation, simple adultery, uncomplicated by machinations against the existing marriage, was regarded as an impediment to the marriage of the adulterous couple, and to any subsequent marriage of a person guilty of adultery (100). The Justinian code prohibits the marriage of adulterers to each other, and canon law up till the time of Peter Lombard was inclined to forbid marriage to any woman "souillée par l'adultère, ou même par la fornication" (101). Gratian quotes a decision of Leo I (440-61) that "nullus ducat in matrimonium, quam prius polluit in adulterio" (102), and this earlier strictness finds an echo in Jostice et Plet, where a decision of Clement III is accompanied

(98) According to A. Bride ("Empêchements de Mariage", DDC vol.V, col.274) it was these successors who, between 1187 and 1198, had most influence in defining the impediment.

(99) See, for example, Corpus Juris Canonici vol.II, lib.IV, tit.VII, cap.I, where Alexander III upholds the marriage of a man who had committed adultery with his second spouse during the lifetime of the first, because his partner in adultery had been ignorant of the fact that he was married. The same judgment is also given by Innocent III (1198-1216), loc. cit., cap.VII.

(100) DDC, s.v. "Crime, Empêchement de Mariage", vol.IV, col.765.

(101) Esmein, op. cit., vol.I, p.427.

(102) Decretum caus.XXXI, q.II, quoted by G.Oesterlé, DDC vol.IV, col.765.



by the note "que nul ne pot avoir à feme cele que il a cochié en avotire" (103). The nullity of all marriages between adulterers was, however, "susceptible de faciles dispenses" (104), and it was no doubt this facility which later led to the abandonment of the principle that an adulterous couple was incapable of marrying under any circumstances. Dispensations in cases of criminal adultery, on the other hand, were rare; even Innocent IV, who was generally liberal in granting dispensations, allowed only two such cases (105).

vi) Cultus Disparitas.

The early Church regarded marriages between Christians and pagans with disapproval, and imposed penances on those who arranged them (106), but it was not till the twelfth century that such marriages were formally declared to be null (107). The declaration, however, had its roots in the sense of abhorrence which the Church had always felt for such marriages: "elle résulte d'une coutume commune, et de l'universelle discipline de l'Eglise" (108). The impediment was not normally subject to dispensation; the Church preferred to insist on the conversion of the pagan, who had to be baptised before he or she could validly marry a Christian.

---

(103) Jostice et Plet book X, tit.VII, §§4 and 5.

(104) Esmein, op. cit., vol.I, p.428.

(105) Dauvillier, op. cit., pp.213-4.

(106) DDC, s.v., "Empêchements", vol.V, col.267.

(107) DDC, s.v., "Disparité de culte", vol.IV, col.1279.

(108) Benedict XIV, quoted by R. Naz, DDC vol.IV, col.1279.

vii) Vis.

"La où est force n'est pas mariage", declared the commentator of Jostice et Plet (109). This impediment, more often known as vis et metus, was elaborated as a direct result of the triumph of consensualism, and laid down the important principle that a forced consent was no consent, and did not create a valid marriage.

The Justinian code, which, as we have seen, had a decisive influence on the development of the doctrine of consent, decreed that "matrimonium inter invitos non contrahitur" (110). However, the force envisaged was physical, and not moral; a marriage contracted under moral coercion was in fact valid under the Justinian code, though it could be dissolved.

When the Church began to adopt the Justinian marriage regulations in the late eleventh century, the battle for the enforcement of the principle of indissolubility was still being fought. To admit the dissolution of marriages made through moral pressure would have destroyed the goal towards which the Church had been struggling for so long; the only solutions were either to declare such marriages indissoluble, or to include moral coercion in the Justinian principle that force nullified consent. The latter course was adopted, in accordance both with the contemporary emphasis on agreement as the formative element in marriage, and with the previous efforts of numerous councils in

---

(109) Jostice et Plet, book X, tit.I, §13.

(110) Quoted in DDC vol.IV, col.324 ("Consentement matrimonial: Vis et metus").

the sixth and seventh centuries, and of Pope Nicholas I in the ninth century, to prevent temporal lords from forcing marriage on their more defenceless subjects (111). A similar abuse was that of parents who imposed marriage on their daughters, a practice condemned by Ivo of Chartres in his collection of canons which appeared in c.1095 (112). However, "ce n'est qu'à l'époque de Gratien que commence l'évolution scientifique de cet empêchement de violence et de crainte" (113).

The nullity deduced by Gratian for such cases was officially pronounced by Alexander III on several occasions (114), but with caution; Alexander wanted to be sure that the force used had really been such as "qui posset in virum constantem cadere", for, as he pointed out, "inter vim et vim sit differentia " (115). His successors followed his lead, using the same criterion of the "constans vir" to establish the degree of force used on both men and women. Honorius III (1216-27), for example, dealt with women who "veniunt ad valvas ecclesiae benedicendae cum sponsis, et ibi reclamantes affirmant, se nunquam in eorum matrimonium consensisse", by declaring that such pleas should only be heard if the woman demonstrated her aversion by running away from her husband before the marriage had been

---

(111) Ibid., cols 324-5.

(112) A. Esmein, Le Mariage en Droit Canonique, first edition, vol. I (Paris 1891), p.155.

(113) DDC vol. IV col.325.

(114) Dauvillier, op.cit., p.90 and refs.

(115) Corpus Juris Canonici, vol.II, lib.IV, tit.I, cap.6 and cap.15. See also Jostice et Plet book X, tit.I, §§6 and 15.

consummated, and if she could prove that she had been forced into the match by "metus ... qui potuit cadere in constantem virum" (116).

However, not all popes were as uncompromising towards such girls as Honorius III. R. Metz finds evidence both in Gratian's Decretum and in the decretals of Innocent III (1198-1216) and Gregory IX (1227-41) that "la présomption de la contrainte n'est pas admise au profit de l'homme; elle l'est au contraire assez facilement au profit de la femme, plus influençable" (117).

The use of strong moral or physical coercion, then, dirimated any marriage to which consent was thus extracted. The impediment was known to the authorities quoted by Gratian, and its use in practice was further developed by Alexander III. By the time of Honorius III, it had evidently become a well-known way of evading an unwanted marriage, and women who did not care for their destined husband often alleged that they were being forced into marriage in circumstances where strict Church doctrine saw only an easily-vanquished reluctance. However, girls who gave proof of irrevocable aversion to the match imposed on them could usually obtain a sympathetic hearing from the Church; Honorius III himself declares that they "erunt non immerito audiendae" (118).

---

(116) Corpus Juris Canonici vol.II, lib.IV, tit.I, cap.28. See also Jostice et Plet, book X, tit.I, §28.

(117) "Le Statut de la Femme en Droit Canonique Médiéval", Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin XII (1962) p.109.

(118) Corpus Juris Canonici, loc. cit.

Such force would normally be exerted by a girl's parents and family (the amis charnels), and was inherited from the Germanic system under which a daughter was "tout à fait asservie, et pouvait être contrainte au mariage à n'importe quel âge" (119). Yet, despite the operation of the impediment, parental pressure continued to be used to such an extent throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries that Mme. J. M. Turlan can speak of "le rôle à peu près inexistant de la volonté des enfants dans la conclusion du mariage" (120).

Another aspect of the same problem was the tendency of the laity to regard a marriage as invalid unless parental permission had been granted. This again was a survival of earlier customs, for, as R. Metz points out, the father's permission had been "une condition essentielle du mariage valide" until the mid-twelfth century (121). Canon law declared that parental consent was not essential, but "évidemment il recommande le respect dû aux parents pour un acte aussi important que le mariage" (122). Here again, Mme Turlan has found many instances in which parental permission seems in practice to be regarded as essential for the validity of the marriage (123).

---

(119) Esmein, Le Mariage en Droit canonique, second edition (Paris 1935), vol.I, p.168.

(120) "Recherches sur le mariage dans la pratique coutumière (XIIe-XVIIe siècles)", Nouvelle Revue Historique de Droit Français et Etranger XXXV (1957) p.487. Examples of parental and family force are given on pp.487-499 of the article.

(121) Art. cit., p.87.

(122) Ibid., loc. cit.

(123) Art. cit., pp.487-503.

A similar problem was created by the rights of overlords to sanction the marriages of their serfs and of their female vassals, and even to force their own choice of husband on the latter. The lord's right to insist that a woman who inherited one of his fiefs should marry was a natural consequence of the military service owed by the holders of fiefs; a lord was not expected to have his fief served by someone who could neither "faidam levere vel pugnam facere" (124). Indeed, the Consuetudines Feudorum exclude women from the inheritance of fiefs altogether, except by express permission of the lord who, in bestowing a fief, might allow that it could be inherited by the vassal's daughter in default of a male heir; the phrase "sibi vel heredibus suis masculis vel his deficientibus feminis" appears to have been a common formula used on such occasions (125).

Once it had thus been admitted that women could in fact inherit fiefs, "il est juste qu'après la mort du père, le seigneur veille sur le mariage de la fille héritière mineure, afin de ne pas se voir imposer à la suite de ce mariage, un Tenant militaire qui ne serait pas de son choix et pourrait même être un ennemi. Il leur offre donc un parti de son choix, en évitant soigneusement de les marier en dessous de leur condition" (126). It was difficult for the heiress to evade

---

(124) Consuetudines Feudorum, edited by C. Lehmann (Göttingen 1892), p. 9, §2.

(125) Ibid., loc. cit., and p.13, tit.IV; p.21 §14; p.30-31 §20; p.32 §24.

(126) F. Jouon des Longrais, "Le Statut de la Femme en Angleterre dans le Droit Commun Médiéval", Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin XII (1962) pp.157-8. See also Dauvillier, op.cit., p.189.

the suzerain's will, especially as he normally expected to make a handsome profit from the man to whom he assigned her and her lands. This mercenary attitude was particularly marked in Norman England (127).

If, however, the Anglo-Norman heiress could resist until the age of sixteen, she was then freed from the legal guardianship of her overlord (128). Yet even this rule on majority was not universal; for, according to F. Ragueau, "les femmes veuves et les filles au dessous de 60 ans, qui possedoient des Fiefs de corps ou chargez de services personnels et militaires, devoient autrefois le mariage à leurs Seigneurs Feudaux " (129). Ragueau, however, is here posing as a general rule a disposition peculiar to the Assises de Jérusalem, whose provisions for the lord's supervision of the marriage of his female vassals are unusually far-reaching. In the kingdom of Jerusalem, a female vassal who did not choose a husband acceptable to her overlord could be forced to marry one of three men selected by him, on pain of forfeiting the fief (130); no doubt Jouon des Lonrais' remark on the English right of wardship and marriage, that "ce droit semble ... une mesure de prudence en pays conquis," (131), is also valid for the extensive powers of the overlord in Jerusalem. Other areas where the overlord's rights to sanction the marriage of his

---

(127) Jouon des Lonrais, art. cit., pp.157-161.

(128) Ibid., art. cit., p.148.

(129) Glossaire du Droit François, edited by M. Eusèbe de Laurière, 2 vols (Paris 1704), s.v. "Mariage", vol.II, p.95.

(130) Assises et Bons Usages du Royaume de Jérusalem, edited by Jean d'Ibelin (Bourges 1690), caps CCXLII - CCXLVI.

(131) Art. cit., p.158.

female vassals were particularly strong were in Scotland and in Normandy (132). In Scotland, the lord could take back the fief of a vassal who, having no male heir, arranged for his daughter a marriage which the lord had not approved (133); in Normandy, both heirs and heiresses who were wards of their overlord had to have his permission to marry (134).

In northern France, however, the lord's rights became more limited, as Dauvillier points out (135). It seems that this limitation, which later spread to the Anglo-Norman empire, was a consequence of the insistence of canon law on free consent in marriage; yet "nulle part, ni dans les conciles généraux ou locaux, ni dans les décrétales, nous ne voyons combattre ce principe féodal" (136). Worse still: the popes themselves, as overlords, exercised their feudal rights to enforce the marriage of their choice on their female vassals as fully as they could.

---

(132) Dauvillier, op. cit., pp.189-90.

(133) Ragueau, op. cit. pp.95-6.

(134) J. Dauvillier, "Le Consentement Seigneurial au mariage des vassaux, et particulièrement des vassales, dans les textes normands", Revue Historique de Droit Français et Etranger, XIV (1935), pp.795-8.

(135) Le Mariage dans le Droit Classique, p.190: "Le Consentement Seigneurial" pp.796-7. Dauvillier also notes here that the lord's rights over his female vassals in Scotland and England, though considerable, were less extensive than those recorded by Jean d'Ibelin for the Kingdom of Jerusalem.

(136) Dauvillier, art. cit., p.797.



Failure to conform to papal instructions in this respect could result in the excommunication of the heiress, and there seems to have been no recognition, on the part of either popes or heiresses, that such a threat might constitute vis et metus. On the other hand, it was admitted that a papal ward who took a husband without the Pope's permission was, at least, validly married (137). In general "les papes ont appliqué le Droit féodal sur ce point, mais ne se sont pas entièrement comportés comme l'aurait fait un seigneur féodal ordinaire, puisqu'ils ont sanctionné par une peine spirituelle une obligation purement temporelle" (138).

Thus the efforts of the Church to ensure, through the application of the impediment of vis, that matrimonial consent was freely given and not made subject to outside pressure or ratification, were far from successful. This lack of success was due in part to the force of deep-rooted secular prejudices in favour of the authority of parents and overlords, and in part to the failure of churchmen themselves to free themselves from the same prejudices. They could not admit that parental coercion invalidated a marriage unless a girl gave proof, by running away from her husband at the earliest possible moment, that she could not be brought to give consent to the match by any means except force; and they did not recognise that the pressure which overlords could legally exert on their female

---

(137) Dauvillier, Le mariage dans le droit classique de l'Eglise (Paris 1933), pp.190-91.  
 (138) Dauvillier, loc. cit.

vassals was a restriction on the freedom of those heiresses' consent. Nevertheless, the impediment was applied, and, within the narrow definition of fear "qui cadet in constantem virum", effectively so.

viii) Ordo.

Although holy orders did not include a specific vow of chastity, the Church had long striven to impose continence on clerics. The marriages of men in holy orders were not, however, declared null until 1139, when, at the second Lateran council, Innocent II officially pronounced that bishops, priests, deacons and sub-deacons were incapacitated from marrying by the impediment of ordo (139).

ix) Ligamen.

As we have noted, this was one of the earliest cases of nullity to be recognised by the Church (140). Indeed, bigamy had never been tolerated, and the only development necessary was the classification of bigamous "marriages" as unions dirimated by the impediment of ligamen. This classification, like that of most of the other impediments, took place during the twelfth century and went hand in hand with the gradual definition of marriage as a consensual contract (141).

In the modern Church, "l'empêchement de ligamen est de droit divin, naturel et positif et n'admet point de dispense" (142). In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries,

---

(139) DDC, s.v. "Voeux de Religion", vol.VII, col.1624.  
 (140) Above, p. 75.  
 (141) On these general developments, see DDC, s.v. "Empêchements de Mariage", vol.IV, col.272.  
 (142) DTC, vol.IX, col.748.

however, it was possible to obtain papal permission for a second marriage in circumstances which amounted to a dispensation from the impediment of ligamen. These special cases had their origin in Merovingian attenuations of the principle of indissolubility for people whose conjoint had been missing or captive for seven years, and who could, according to the discipline of certain penitentials, marry again as a remedy for their concupiscence (143). In some penitentials, the delay required might be only five or even three years.

In the tighter discipline of the twelfth century, such abuses were no longer tolerated; yet long absence was still accepted as an excuse for remarriage, on condition that the absent spouse could reasonably be presumed dead. Thus, in 1170 or 1171, a woman whose husband had been absent for ten years and could not be traced was allowed to remarry by her bishop. Alexander III allowed this second marriage to stand, though he warned that it would be nullified if the missing husband reappeared; the bishop, apparently, thought that the second marriage would still be valid even if it was proved that the first husband was still alive (144). In another case, where the man had only been absent for five years, Alexander III in fact granted a dispensation for the wife to remarry, suggesting that he regarded this second marriage as one which would not be nullified by the reappearance of the

---

(143) DTC, s.v. "Divorce", vol.IV, cols 1467-8.

(144) Dauvillier, op. cit., pp.304-5.

first husband (145). The case, however, was an unusual one in that the first marriage had never been consummated, and as we have seen, Alexander III was more ready than his successors to grant dispensations for unconsummated marriages (146). Yet here, as in other cases, Alexander "se montre singulièrement facile à admettre la mort du premier conjoint. Sur simple présomption, il permet un second mariage à l'époux abandonné, si, après enquête, l'absent ne peut être retrouvé, sans exiger que soit prouvée la mort du conjoint absent" (147). The search in such cases seems to have been a fairly comprehensive one instituted by the ecclesiastical authorities, and death was not presumed until the search had proved fruitless; nevertheless, enough doubt subsisted in most cases for the proviso to be made that, should the absent spouse return, the first marriage would be restored and the second one annulled.

After Alexander III, there was less laxity on this point. Clement III and Lucius III insisted on definite proof of death, usually in the form of the certus nuncius of three reliable men, such as pilgrims or crusaders, who had witnessed the death of the missing person (148).

---

(145) Ibid., pp. 301-3.

(146) Above, p. 71.

(147) Dauvillier, op. cit., p. 305.

(148) Ibid., pp. 337-9.

x) Honestas.

This impediment, which dirimates any marriage between one partner in a marriage-contract per verba de futuro and a relative of the other partner, or between either partner in an unconsummated marriage and the relations of the other, was one of the last to be elaborated in canon law. Early examples of such a prohibition, in which such marriages were forbidden on grounds of justitia publicae honestatis or quod canonici ratione obviat, are found from the early twelfth century onwards, but the impediment was not fully formulated until the time of Pope Boniface VIII (1294-1303) (149). Peter Lombard scarcely recognised it, except as an aspect of the impediment of affinity, which, for him, arose from the verba de praesenti, and which also dirimated marriage between one conjoint and the relations of the other; in the case of betrothal, however, he did not admit that any bond had been forged which was strong enough to give rise to the impediment. In Gratian's Decretum, on the other hand, the impediment applies both to relationships arising out of an unconsummated marriage and also to those resulting from betrothal, and this double application was maintained in subsequent practice (150). In the early thirteenth century, Bernard of Pavia defined the impediment more closely, pointing out that it did not apply to betrothals between children under the age of puberty (151); over that

---

(149) DDC, s.v. "Honnêteté Publique", vol.V, cols 1179-80.  
 (150) Ibid., cols 1185-6.  
 (151) Ibid., col.1186.

age, however, the impediment extended, like that of consanguinity, to all relations up to the seventh degree. At the fourth Lateran council in 1215, this was restricted to relationships up to the fourth degree. It was Boniface VIII who gave the impediment its widest application, declaring that it existed even if the betrothal or unconsummated marriage from which it derived was later found to be null, unless the nullity arose from lack of agreement (dissensus) or from the fact that one or both parties was under seven years old at the time (aetas) (152).

It was possible to obtain dispensations from honestas, especially for the marriages of great nobles, where the public interest could be shown to be at stake, or in a case mentioned by Dauvillier, where the marriage had already been in existence for many years (153). The likelihood of obtaining such a dispensation was increased in the second half of the thirteenth century, once Innocent IV (1243-54) had set a precedent for granting dispensations on rather less serious grounds than had been required by his predecessors (154).

#### xi) Dissensus.

Under this heading, Hostiensis designated those failures of agreement not already covered by vis. The commonest cast of dissensus arose when marriages arranged by parents for their young children were not ratified by the

---

(152) Ibid., col.1188; Esmein, op. cit., vol.I, pp.163-4.

(153) Dauvillier, op. cit., p.149.

(154) Ibid., pp.213-9.

children on reaching puberty. The recognition of this impediment was dependent on that of the complementary impediment of aetas - the admission that, under a certain age, children were incapable of giving a valid consent to their marriage. Aetas is not listed by Hostiensis as a separate impediment; it seems likely, however, that he thought of it as an aspect of dissensus, and we shall consider it under this heading (155).

Originally, the Church had followed civil laws and customs, which generally stipulated that children under the age of puberty could not contract marriage. In the Germanic countries, the legal age required before a man could marry was twenty-one; the Church endorsed this law, but churchmen were also ready to accept the marriages so frequently arranged by parents <sup>for children</sup> still in their cradles (156). The children were bound by such arrangements, even though they had not been legally capable of contracting at the time when the arrangement was made. Nevertheless, the Church was already reacting against this state of affairs in the Frankish period. A letter attributed to Pope Nicholas I (858-67) reads : "Districtius inhiibemus, ne de cetero aliqui, quorum uterque vel alter ad aetatem legibus vel canonibus determinatam <sup>non</sup> pervenerit, coniungantur, nisi forte aliqua urgentissima necessitate interveniente, utpote pro bono pacis, talis coniunctio toleretur" (157).

---

(155) Bartholomew of Brescia, who was a near contemporary of Hostiensis, included aetas in his own mnemonic, but omitted dissensus. The verse is quoted in DDC vol.V, col.272.

(156) W. Onclin, "L'Age requis pour le mariage dans la doctrine canonique médiévale" in Proceedings of the Second International Congress of Medieval Canon Law, edited by S. Kuttner and J. J. Ryan (Vatican City, 1965), pp.237-8.

(157) Corpus Juris Canonici, vol.II, lib.IV, tit.II, cap.2; quoted by W. Onclin, loc. cit.

However, it is not certain that Nicholas was in fact the author of this decretal, and few other protests seem to have been made until the eleventh century, when Ivo of Chartres took a firm stand against child marriages (158). Gratian, who adopted the Roman rule that marriages between children under seven were null, is apparently the first canonist to mention a definite age below which children are incapable of contracting. He allowed that children could validly enter into a matrimonium initiatum at the age of seven, but the marriage did not become fully indissoluble until it was ratified by the couple at the age of puberty. A child might therefore free himself from his marriage by dissensus in matura aetate (159). The age of seven was also adopted by Peter Lombard; under seven, children were incapable of making any valid contract, and between seven and puberty they could only give consent to their marriage per verba de futuro. On reaching the legal age of puberty - fourteen for boys and twelve for girls, following the Roman system - children could validly marry each other by verba de praesenti. Any contract made de praesenti before puberty was considered by the Lombard to be a contract de futuro only, and it could be nullified by dissensus in matura aetate. However, if the children did not express such dissent, they became fully conjuges on reaching the required age, and their union could no longer be dissolved, even if their parents had changed their minds since the original desponsatio (160).

---

(158) DDC vol.I, col.343.

(159) Esmein, op. cit., vol.I, pp.237-8.

(160) Dauvillier, op. cit., p.44.



Alexander III endorsed the Lombard's system, though with some modification. For him, dissensus at the legal age of puberty had no effect if the children had in fact reached puberty before the ages of twelve and fourteen, and had consummated their union : "Si simul esse noluerint, separentur; nisi forte carnalis commixtio ante intervenierit" (161). In such cases, malitia suppleat aetatem; the children do not need to wait until they have reached the legal age of puberty, and their marriage is already valid and indissoluble (162). As a result, children who were pubertati proximi were in a special category, and could in fact marry under the legal age of consent. This dual application of the impediment of aetas was maintained by subsequent Popes, who adopted the rule that marriage below the legal age of puberty was dirimated by the impediment, except where the children were pubertati proximi and had consummated their marriage.

Thus dissensus and aetas were complementary impediments. Both were methods of dealing with the abuses of child marriage and of mitigating some of the force of medieval betrothal, by stipulating that no valid marriage could be made between children under the age of puberty, and that such children had the right to ratify any marriage which their parents might have made in their names when they reached the "mature years" of twelve or fourteen.

---

(161) Corpus Juris Canonici, vol.II, lib.IV, tit.II, cap.8.

(162) This is one application of the matrimonium praesumptum; see above, pp.<sup>64-70</sup> and Onclin, art. cit., pp.240ff.

Dispensations from the impediment of aetas were fairly readily granted in the twelfth century, especially in cases where parents could show that their children's marriage was necessary pro bono pacis (163). However, such a dispensation became meaningless once it was recognised that the children themselves could always nullify the marriage on reaching puberty, and from the election of Innocent III (1198) until the end of the thirteenth century there is no record of a Papal dispensation for a child marriage (164).

Dissensus, however, also covered certain other cases where the consent necessary for the marriage-contract was lacking. One of these cases was that which later came to be known as the impediment of rape, in which marriage to a girl who had been carried off against her parents' will was presumed to be null through lack of the girl's agreement, unless she proved the contrary by establishing conjugal relations with the raptor (165).

Another instance of dissensus was the marriage of mad people. Such marriages would be nullified through lack of consent, unless they were recontracted during an interval of lucidity (166).

---

(163) Dauvillier, op. cit., pp.141-2.

(164) Ibid., pp.201-219.

(165) DDC, s.v. "Empêchements", vol.V, col.273.

(166) Esmein, op. cit., vol.I, pp.335-6.

Lack of consent could also be seen in cases where, for one reason or another, one partner in a wedding expressed a consensus which did not correspond to his true feelings. This problem "fournissait aux sophismes un beau sujet" (167); the same marriage might be valid as regards the forum externum and null in the forum internum, or vice versa, and the possible permutations of judgment were endless. Indeed, "cette question du consentement feint n'eut jamais ... dans la législation ecclésiastique du Moyen Age une solution parfaitement claire" (168). Peter Lombard insisted on the validity of the consent verbally expressed: "Si on exprime par des paroles ce qu'on ne veut pas dans son coeur, le mariage existe, du moment qu'il n'y a pas eu violence ou dol" (169). In the same vein, Sicardus of Cremona, in about 1180, wrote: "Si quis interne non consentit, sed externe, quamvis simulate, consensum manifestat, speciei seu simulato consensui majoris vis juridica attribuenda est quam realitati; nam de internis non judicat Ecclesia" (170). Yet his contemporary, Huguccio, writing in about 1187-90, declared that such a marriage would be null (171). Huguccio's views had a strong influence on Innocent III, who decided that a marriage made by a feigned consent would be null if the man concerned had had absolutely no intention of marrying the girl, "quod ille eam non proposuit ducere in uxorem, nec unquam consensit in praedictam personam" (172).

---

(167) Le Bras, "*Mariage*", DTC vol.IX col.2188.

(168) DTC IX col.2189.

(169) Dauvillier, op. cit., p.12.

(170) Quoted in DTC vol.IV, col.303 ("Consentement Matrimonial").

(171) Dauvillier, op. cit., p.99.

(172) Corpus Juris Canonici, vol.II, lib.IV, tit.I, cap.26. This is the case of "Iohannes", already referred to: see above, p.77.

After Innocent III, the tendency to regard such marriages as valid in law, if invalid in the forum internum, remained a source of possible conflict between the theologians and the canonists throughout the period in which we are interested (173).

xii) Affinis.

Once a husband and wife had become one flesh in the sexual act, they were linked to each other's relations by the bond of affinity, and marriages between people thus "related" were null. Impediments to marriages between people connected by affinity had existed in both Roman and Judaic law, but the Church greatly extended the impediment's range, in the same way as that of the complementary impediment of consanguinity was extended (174). Thus, from the tenth century until 1215, marriages between affines up to the seventh degree of relationship were null. Moreover, until this date, "l'affinité se multipliait elle-même et engendrait l'empêchement à l'endroit des alliés des alliés", creating affinitas secundi generis and tertii generis between second husbands of widowed spouses of relatives of the original married couple (175). Such a system was unworkable in practice, and the fourth Lateran council wisely restricted the effects of affinity, like those of consanguinity, to the fourth degree, and abolished the impediments resulting from the second and third kinds of affinity (176).

---

(173) Dauvillier, op. cit., pp.99-100.

(174) DDC, s.v. 'Affinité', vol.I, cols 271-2.

(175) Dauvillier, op. cit., p.147. For definitions of the three kinds of affinity, see DDC vol.I, cols 277-8.

(176) Dauvillier, op.cit., pp.150-1.

Since affinity was the direct result of the unitas carnis, it did not take effect if the marriage was unconsummated. This principle was already known to Hincmar of Reims in the ninth century (177), and continued to be the doctrine of the Church, despite the attempt of Peter Lombard to re-define affinity as a relationship resulting exclusively from the verba de praesenti (178). The Summa of Bernard of Pavia (1179) states the "official" view in the section "Unde inter sponsam et consanguineos sponsi nulla est affinitas, nisi coitus interveniat" (179). The relationship between families arising out of an unconsummated marriage was eventually covered, as we have seen, by the impediment of honestas, which is in this sense the counterpart of affinitas.

Although affinity primarily affected the partners in a consummated marriage and their relatives, it had two further applications. The first of these was a logical consequence of the link between affinity and the unitas carnis. Known as affinitas ex copula illicita, it held that affinity was created by any carnal union, whether within marriage or outside it. This idea grew up in the eighth century, and the council of Compiègne took a very stern view of those who flouted the impediment: "Similiter et de duabus sororibus, qui cum una in adulterio mansit, et alteram in publico accepit, non habeat mulierem usque in diem mortis" (180).

---

(177) DDC, vol.V, col.1184.

(178) For Peter Lombard, affinity and honestas were indistinguishable; see above, p. 96.

(179) Esmein, op. cit., vol.I, p.421 n.2.

(180) Quoted in DDC vol.I, col.273 ("Affinité").

In the twelfth century, Gratian, Rolandus (the future Alexander III) and Bernard of Pavia all recognised the extension of the impediment to relations arising out of illicit copulation (181), and in the thirteenth century, the case merits a title of its own in Gregory IX's decretals (182).

The impediment of illicit affinity was handled with circumspection by the Church, because of the danger of breaking up a perfectly valid marriage on a trumped-up and unproveable charge that one partner had previously had sexual relations with a relative of the other - a very convenient excuse for dissatisfied spouses. Alexander III, for example, would not annul a marriage in which the husband's brother alleged that he had previously slept with the bride and that she had therefore married an affine in the second degree "nisi hoc publicum et notorium fuerit aut idoneis testibus comprobatum" (183). Celestinus III (1191-8) put the matter still more plainly: "Si aliter veritas ordinario indicio venire non potuerit in lucem, propter eorum confessionum tantum vel rumorem viciniae separari non debeat, quum et quandoque nonnulli inter se contra matrimonium velint colludere" (184). Only where there was a strong weight of proof could a marriage be annulled on the grounds of affinitas ex comula illicita.

(181) Ibid., cols 273-4.

(182) Corpus Juris Canonici, vol.II, lib.IV, tit.XIII : De eo qui cognovit consanguineam uxoris suae vel sponsae. See also Jostice et Plet, book X, tit.XIII.

(183) Corpus Juris Canonici, vol.II, lib.IV, tit.XIII, cap.3. See also Jostice et Plet, book X, tit.XIII, §3: "Note que l'en doit savoir se péchié est apert ou non."

(184) Corpus Juris Canonici, vol.II, lib.IV, tit.XIII, cap.5.

The same difficulty over proof was apparent in the second extension of the impediment, that of affinitas superveniens. This arose when sexual intercourse with a relative of the sponsa or sponsus occurred after the marriage had been contracted, and thus created between the couple an affinity which had not existed at the time of the contract. Could such a subsequent change in circumstances have a retrospective effect and dirimate an originally valid union? If not, what was the position of the couple who found themselves married within the forbidden degrees of affinity?

It was not easy to find a satisfactory answer to these questions. Alexander III, and other authorities in the twelfth century and earlier, admitted that subsequent affinity, when a public and notorious fact, could indeed dissolve a previously contracted marriage, but only if the union had not been consummated (185). In this case, since the marriage was dissolved, all three parties were free to marry someone else after a suitable penance (186). In other cases, where affinity affected a consummated marriage, the guilty parties might be refused all hope of a future marriage even after the death of their conjoint, as a penance for having sinned against the sacrament (187).

---

(185) Dauvillier, op. cit., p.53; DDC, s.v. "Consommation", vol.IV, col.372.

(186) Corpus Juris Canonici, vol.II, lib.IV, tit.XIII, cap.II.

(187) Corpus Juris Canonici, vol.II, lib.IV, tit.XIII, caps 1 and 8. See also the comment in Jostice et Plet book X, tit.XIII, §1.

Affinitas superveniens was thus one of the two causes allowed by Alexander III for the dissolution of an unconsummated marriage, that consensual contract whose indissolubility had been so slowly won. His successors reacted against this flaw in the consensualist system, and maintained the indissolubility of an unconsummated marriage where subsequent affinity had arisen. On this point, the Corpus Juris Canonici is formal : "Affinitas superveniens non dissolvit sponsalia de praesenti" (188). From Innocent III (1198-1216) onwards, this was the law the Popes held to.

There was less hesitation where affinitas superveniens affected a consummated marriage. The councils of Verberie and Compiègne had dissolved the marriage in such cases and allowed the innocent spouse to remarry, while denying any hope of a future marriage to the guilty pair whose adultery had given rise to the affinity. However, this form of divorce was rejected by Gratian, for whom the innocent partner was only free to remarry after the death of the guilty one. After Gratian, it was generally recognised that a consummated marriage could not in any sense be dissolved by affinitas superveniens (189). The couple must remain together, but the guilty partner was punished by being refused the right to demand fulfilment of the debitum conjugalis from his spouse (190).

---

(188) Vol.II, lib.IV, tit.XIII, heading to cap.6. See also the decretal of Innocent III, tit.XIII, cap.10.

(189) On the eighth-century councils, see DDC vol.I, s.v. "Affinité", cols.274-5, and DTC vol.I, s.v. "Adultère: L'Adultère incestueux et le lien du mariage jusqu'au XIIe siècle", cols.489-93.

(190) Corpus Juris Canonici, vol.II, lib.IV, tit.XIII, cap.6 and cap.10. See also Jostice et Plet, book X, tit.XIII, §4.



Dispensations from the more distant degrees of affinitas were fairly easily obtained until 1215, when Innocent III restricted the impediment to the fourth degree. After this date, there was considerable variation in the policy of granting dispensations, with Popes in the second half of the thirteenth century being generally far more lenient than their immediate predecessors (191).

xiii) Si coire nequibis.

It was only slowly that the Church reached the decision that the impotent were incapable of contracting marriage. Roman law had allowed divorce in all cases, whether the impotence dated from before the marriage or arose after it, and this freedom survived in Church practice until the middle of the eighth century, as can be seen from decisions given at the councils of Verberie and Compiègne and in the penitential attributed to Theodore of Canterbury (192). The growing acceptance of the principle of indissolubility, however, necessitated some re-thinking, and several different methods of dealing with the marriage of the impotent had been developed by the middle of the twelfth century.

For Gratian, to whom the copula was an important element in the formation of the conjugal bond, the marriage of an impotent person would be dissolved if consummation had proved impossible; a consummated marriage, however, could not be dissolved if one of the conjoints later became impotent (193).

---

(191) Dauvillier, op. cit., pp.150 and 201-19. The policy on dispensations from affinitas was very similar to that on consanguinity, as outlined above, pp.80-81.

(192) Dauvillier, op. cit., p.175; Esmein, op. cit., vol.I. pp.261-3; and see above, p.57.

(193) Dauvillier, op. cit., p.175.

For Peter Lombard, on the other hand, the impotent were perfectly able to contract a valid marriage, provided that the other partner knew of their condition. Such marriages could only be declared null if one partner had been ignorant of the other's impotence at the time when the verba de praesenti were exchanged; impotence arising at a later date was not a cause of nullity (194).

Peter Lombard's views had some influence on the young Alexander III, but in general the French church held the impotent to be incapable of contracting marriage, and therefore annulled their unions (195). The Papacy, on the other hand, held throughout most of the twelfth century to a totally different view, which was imposed on those cases which came under the jurisdiction of the Roman church. For the Popes, impotence did not in any circumstances invalidate a marriage, and couples thus affected must live together in wedlock as brother and sister (196). This strict indissolubility, however, could not be maintained. Not only was it seen to push the

---

(194) Esmein, op. cit., vol.I, p.266.

(195) Dauvillier, op. cit., p.176. The nullity of such unions is emphasised in the French Justice et Plet, book X, tit.XV, §2, 3 and 4.

(196) Such a decision is given in a decretal, Corpus Juris Canonici, vol.II, lib.IV, tit.XV, cap.4, which may emanate either from Alexander III or from Lucius III (1181-5). Since this was not the policy eventually adopted by the Church, it seems that, as Esmein says, (op. cit., vol.I, p.268), the decretal was inserted into the Corpus by mistake. G.Oesterlé (DDC vol.V, s.v. "Impuissance", col.1263), considers that the injunction to live together as brother and sister was simply a recommendation, and was not enforced in countries where the idea of nullity for impotent marriages was deeply entrenched.

normal spouse into adultery and even murder (197), but also it upheld unions which fulfilled only one of the three goals for which matrimony was ordained. The marriage of the impotent might, indeed, be a sacrament, but it neither remedied human concupiscence nor brought Christian children into the world (198).

By the second quarter of the thirteenth century, a more coherent and humane system had been reached. The Church as a whole, rejecting both Peter Lombard's and the Popes' viewpoint, judged impotence to be an impediment which dirimated any marriage-contract made by the afflicted person, whether or not the other partner knew of it at the time. However, the impediment only took effect if it existed at the time the contract was made; those who were unfortunate enough to become impotent at a later date were usually unable to free themselves, for they had been indissolubly bound together by a valid marriage per verba de praesenti. Thus the case envisaged by Gratian, of the person who had become impotent after making the verbal marriage-contract and before consummating the union, was no longer subject to dissolution.

It was generally recognised in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries that women, as well as men, might be unable to perform the sexual act (199). Impotence in a woman might arise from a deformity, or from illness; in the latter case, both Gratian and the young Alexander III allowed the dissolution of a marriage where consummation had been made

---

(197) Esmein, op. cit., vol.I, pp.267-8.

(198) A contemporary discussion of the presence of the three bona in such a marriage can be found in Causa viri ementulati et eius uxoris petentis fieri divorcium, edited by M.L.Colker, Medievalia et Humanistica, XII (1958), pp.11-15.

(199) DDC vol.V, s.v. "Impuissance", col.1265.

impossible by the wife's incurable illness, following the example of Gregory II who had made a similar decision in a letter of 726 A.D. (200).

Two major problems bedevilled the working of the impediment of impotentia coeundi. The first of these was the possibility of impotence being caused by a magic spell, which might or might not be reversible. Hincmar of Reims, in the eighth century, "a acueilli les préjugés populaires qui attribuaient, la plupart du temps, l'impuissance au sortilège" (201), and the case remained a very real possibility for succeeding canonists. How else, indeed, to explain the fact that a man might be fully capable of normal sexual relations with a number of women, yet impotent in the conjugal bed? Hincmar allowed that divorce was possible in such cases, though only after every means of exorcising the spell had proved inefficacious. This attitude was maintained by later writers, who held that impotence caused by a sortilegium was as much an impediment as natural impotence (202). Indeed, the impediment was even more far-reaching in its effects when it was caused by a spell, for in such cases both husband and wife might be free to remarry, since neither of them was afflicted by a permanent natural impotence which would have made them legally incapable of marrying (203).

---

(200) Gregory's letter is quoted by Gratian in Corpus Juris Canonici, vol.I, caus. XXXII, q.VII, cap. XVIII.

(201) Esmein, op. cit., vol.I, p.264.

(202) Dauvillier, op. cit., pp.178-9. The section on this impediment in the Corpus Juris Canonici is headed "De frigidis et maleficiatis, et impotentia coeundi": vol.II, lib. IV, tit. XV.

(203) Esmein, op. cit., p.275; Dauvillier, op. cit., pp.176, 179 & 182. As Dauvillier shows, there was considerable uncertainty on this point.

The second problem which affected this impediment was that of proof. Couples whose marriage was not particularly happy might well trump up a charge of impotence and support each other's testimony before the bishop, as Beaumanoir warned:

Il n'est pas mestiers que la cours de crestienté se passe legièrément des ples qui nissent de mariage depecier, tout soit ce que li maris tesmoigne ce que la fame propose contre li, car puet estre qu'il tesmoignent ensemble la cause de departir mariage pour ce qu'il vuelent bien la departie, pour ce qu'il se vuelent remarier alieus ou par haine qui est meue entre aus ... Si comme se la fame dist que l'hons est teus qu'il ne puet engendrer et il le connoist pour ce qu'il veut bien la dessevrance (204).

In such cases, the couple's avowals would have to be supported by the oaths of seven reliable witnesses, usually close relatives (205). Physical inspection might be resorted to in cases where one partner's allegation that the marriage had never been consummated was denied by the other partner, who asserted his or her potency (206); and, for cases where a magic spell was suspected, a trial period of three years was often imposed, to discover whether the effects of the spell were durable (207). The same period of trial was also used if it was possible that the impotence was caused by delayed puberty (208).

---

(204) Coutumes de Beauvaisis, §593.

(205) Dauvillier, op. cit., p.181.

(206) Unless impotence could be proved by this means, such disputes were normally settled in favour of the partner who maintained the validity of the marriage; see DDC vol.V, s.v. "Impuissance", col.1266.

(207) Ibid., col.1266; Dauvillier, op. cit., pp.181-2.

(208) W.Onclin, art. cit., p.245.

Each of the impediments we have been describing would make null and void any marriage-contract which it affected. In some cases, the annulment would leave both partners free to marry elsewhere; in other cases (crimen, ligamen, affinitas superveniens, impotentia), one or both partners might be declared incapable of a new marriage. In either event, an accusation of nullity was a serious matter. It could be made either by the couple themselves, in cases where only they would know of the existence of the impediment, such as vis, dissensus or impotentia; or by outsiders, for cases like affinity, consanguinity, bigamy, or crime, which might well be public knowledge (209). The case would be judged by a bishop's court; if it was disputed, appeal might be made to the archbishop or to the Pope.

Our analysis of three major aspects of the canon law of marriage in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries has covered many points which are reflected in the romances studied in this thesis. The principle of indissolubility is explicitly invoked by the heroines of Partonopeus and Ipomedon to justify their hesitation over the choice of a husband. In the romances of Gautier d'Arras, on the other hand, the principle is flouted, as it is in Marie's lais of Bisclavret, Egitan<sup>u</sup> and Fliduc. The importance of betrothal can be seen in the short continuation of Partonopeus, in Galeran de Bretagne and in Jean et Blonde. Galeran de Bretagne contains an explicit

---

(209) DDC vol.III, s.v. "Causes matrimoniales : l'ancien droit", col.71.

reference to the consensus doctrine, but several other works - notably Athis et Prophilias and Amadas - seem to assume that concubitas is more important than consent in forming the marriage-bond. The various impediments frequently apply to the marital situations described in the romances : Cligès touches on votum, vis, crimen, honestas, affinis and impotentia, and would no doubt have presented contemporary canonists with a situation of almost insoluble complexity. Vis and impotentia are also involved in Amadas, as are crimen, cognatio, and the doctrine of the matrimonium praesumptum. In Floire and L'Escoufle we can perhaps see traces of Peter Lombard's views on dissensus, and Floire also involves cultus disparitas. The attitude of twelfth-century Popes to ligamen in cases of presumed death is clearly reflected in Ille et Galeron; Marie's Fresne turns on the impediment of illicit affinity; and conditio might possibly be used to explain the divorce in Joufrois. The reader will be asked to refer to the information in the foregoing pages when we come to examine these reflections of canon law in the romances themselves.

### Part III. Attitudes of Heroes to Marriage

#### Chapter 1. Love Leading to Marriage.

As indicated in the Preface, we shall be looking separately at the attitudes to marriage of the heroes and heroines of the romances chosen for this study.

Turning first to the heroes, one is disconcerted to find that many of them do not seem to be interested in marriage at all. Indeed - with a few exceptions (1) - these heroes seem almost to ignore the prospect of their future marriage, while nevertheless concentrating much of their thought on love. A hero's avowed aim is not usually to marry the heroine, but to deserve her love. If he does set out with the idea of marrying her, he seldom emphasises the fact; as a rule he contents himself with saying that he hopes to win the heroine's heart, and it is only indirectly that we learn that he would like to win her hand as well. Problems like those of gaining her parents' consent, persuading her vassals - if she has any - that he will be a suitable lord, or preventing her being forced into marriage with someone else, scarcely enter his mind; his one concern is with the heroine herself, and her feelings for him. Hence he is usually taken completely unawares by opposition from the heroine's parents, overlord or vassals, and it is often up to her to devise a stratagem by which they may

---

(1) Chrétien's Erec, Gautier d'Arras' *Laïs*, Renaut's Galerent, Jean Renart's Conrad and Guillaume, and Beaumanoir's King of Scotland are exceptional in their readiness to speak of marriage. As we shall see, it is no mere coincidence that all of them, except Guillaume, want to marry girls who are - or appear to be - of lower rank than themselves.



nevertheless marry each other. Indeed, in some works, the hero's indifference to marriage seems almost like reluctance; he may spend months or years deliberately avoiding the girl whose love he has gained, putting her to a great deal of trouble and distress before she can get him to marry her in the end (2).

Most heroes, however, seem to be quite happy to get married at the first reasonable opportunity. Indeed, in many cases it appears that marriage is, after all, the objective they have aimed at from the start, and that their indifference to it is more apparent than real. We shall later suggest some explanations for this tendency of heroes to ignore the subject of marriage even when it is in fact their goal; but first, let us look at some examples of the phenomenon.

One of the earliest instances of this apparent indifference to matrimony on the part of the hero can be seen in Floire et Blanchefleur (3). In the "version aristocratique", the author tells us in his prologue that Floire does indeed marry Blanchefleur. Yet, in the story which follows, we are given hardly any indication that Floire is interested in making such a marriage. For all we learn of the hero's own intentions, his eventual union with Blanchefleur might be simply an arbitrary "happy ending", an event

---

(2) See, for example, Ipomedon and Fergus, and the plot of the Chevalier as Deus Espees as summarized by J. D. Bruce, Evolution of Arthurian Romance vol.II, pp.229-237.

(3) The "aristocratic" version of Floire, edited by M. Pelan, second edition (Strasbourg 1956), is dated 1155-73 by Pelan on p.XII of her edition, note 1. M. Delbouille, in an article to which Pelan does not refer here, suggests the more precise date of "peu après 1160" ("A Propos de la Patrie et de la Date de Floire et Blanchefleur", Mélanges Roques vol.IV, Paris 1952, p.98).

which Floire himself neither foresaw nor desired (4).

The opening idyll of the two schoolchildren is - not surprisingly - undisturbed by any matrimonial plans, at least on Floire's part (lines 217-274). His parents, however, are more inclined to look to the future, and it seems as though it is their concern about his marriage which first puts the idea into their son's head. Certainly, it is his mother's attempt to persuade him to forget Blanchefleur and marry a girl of his own rank which provokes Floire's first statement about making Blanchefleur his wife, when he declares that he will search the world until he has found her, "et se Dieus plest encor l'avra" (884-889). Later, he adds the declaration that:

... pour neant s'en peneroit

Li rois, que ja autre n'avroit. (902-3)

These are Floire's only references to marriage in the two hundred and fifty-odd lines devoted at this stage to his love (see lines 212-268, 361-399, 664-805, and 881-903).

---

(4) The prologue to the "version chevaleresque" of Floire contains no reference to the hero's eventual marriage. In this version, the hero shows the same disregard of the subject as he does in the "version aristocratique", so that I have not felt it necessary here to discuss the second version separately.

Although these two remarks give the impression that Floire's aim in seeking Blanchefleur is indeed to bring her back and marry her (5), his subsequent behaviour is hardly calculated to achieve such goals. Once he has found Blanchefleur, he loses all interest in rescuing her and making her his wife. Instead, he is perfectly content to stay with her in the emir's tower, where they enjoy the delights of love without a thought for the future. Clearly, the solace of Blanchefleur's company is all that Floire has really sought; once he has that, he wants nothing more, and marriage becomes simply irrelevant. The author says unequivocally:

2280      Quinze jours entiers ilec furent;  
             Ensemble mengierent et burent  
             Et orent joie a lor talent  
             Et deduistrent moult lieement ...  
 2288      Se cele vie lor durast  
             Nus d'euls changier ne la rouvast. (6)

---

(5) Floire's only other reference to marriage reinforces this view of his motives. On arriving in Babylon, he has a moment of doubt when the voice of reason suggests that he should abandon his impossible quest, because his father could provide him with a nobler wife for far less trouble (lines 1413-52). Since the alternative to rescuing Blanchefleur is marriage to someone else, it seems clear that Floire thinks of Blanchefleur herself as his future bride.

(6) My italics. Co. M. J. Hubert's translation of *Floire* (Chapel Hill, 1966), pp.14-15: "These characters ... obey the dictates of their hearts and ignore everything else ... They take action merely to bring [their love] to fruition. If such action were not necessary, they would be quite content to spend their lives in amorous delight."

Of course, this readiness to live in the present is necessary for the development of the plot; but that does not alter the fact that, despite his protestations to his parents, Floire shows little positive interest in making Blanchefleur his wife. Although he does indeed want to marry her, and cannot bear the thought of marrying anyone else, his activity is all directed towards finding her, and not to marrying her once she has been found. The wedding is eventually brought about by the initiative of the emir, and does not result from any steps taken by Floire himself; the only activity undertaken by Floire is directed at the restoration and preservation of his love-affair, and not at the official sanctioning of that love-affair in a moustier. Indeed it seems that, for Floire, love is its own sanction. When defending himself and Blanchefleur against the emir's accusations, he does not plead that he had planned to marry Blanchefleur, but justifies his presence in her bed on the grounds of love alone : "Ses amis sui, ele est ma drue" (2472). This remains the basis of his defence throughout his dealings with the emir. In the summary of his speech in lines 2835-56, there is no mention of the fact that he has marriage-plans of his own, which conflict with the emir's; all we are told is :

2840 Comme il ama en sa contree ...

2843 Comment issi de son regné

Pour Blancheflour s'amie querre. (My italics)

Thus it appears that marriage has little importance for Floire, even as a justification of his behaviour. It is love, not marriage, which makes him and Blanchefleur inseparable; marriage only enters his scheme of things when the idea is imposed on him from without.

This may well be because, as M. J. Hubert points out (7), Floire is only a child; the adult concepts of marriage and betrothal have little meaning for him. He scarcely seems to understand his parents' arguments against Blanchefleur; matters such as rank, religion, rich dowries and political alliances seem to him to have nothing to do with the one thing he does understand - his feeling for his sweetheart. So far is he from thinking of marrying Blanchefleur and of the problems it involves, that his parents' action takes him completely by surprise; and his dealings with the emir show a similar lack of foresight, attributable to his youth.

Thus a study of Floire's attitude to marriage heightens our awareness of the author's success in depicting him as a child in conflict with a world whose adult values are, as yet, foreign to him. This childishness sets Floire apart from most other heroes; but, as we shall see, his lack of interest in marriage is by no means untypical.

In Aimon de Varennes' Florimont, written some thirty years after Floire (8), we again find marriage presented from the hero's point of view as relatively unimportant consequence of love. It is in the romance between Florimont and Romadanaple, daughter of King Philip of Macedonia, that the main love-interest of the story lies (9). Yet, although the affair leads to marriage, it is only at the end of it that we find any clear sign that Florimont either wants or expects such an outcome.

---

(7) Op. cit., p.14.

(8) Aimon himself dated his work; it was completed in 1188 (lines 13677-9).

(9) Florimont's earlier liaison with the Pucele de l'Ile Selee is simply a preparation for his love for Romadanaple.

In the early stages of the liaison, the absence of any thought of marriage on Florimont's part can be attributed to his natural diffidence. A poor young adventurer can hardly expect a princess to see him as a suitable husband, and obviously he must think of winning her affection before he can go on to consider marriage (10). Thus we need not be surprised that, in lines 7356-7436 and 7978-8348, Florimont thinks and speaks only of love and of the obstacles in its path, and not of any pretensions he may have to Romadanaple's hand, nor of the obstacles to such a marriage.

Yet, even when he knows that his love is reciprocated, Florimont still does not think about marrying Romadanaple. Instead, his mind is occupied with the problem of keeping his love secret, and with regrets that he cannot see or speak to his beloved - both concerns in which she fully shares (lines 8353-90). Florimont's rôle is entirely passive at this stage; it is Delfin who, acting as go-between, brings him the assurance of Romadanaple's love (8353-75), while the assignation between the lovers is arranged by the nurse Sipriaigne (8406-8558; 8688-8742). During their meeting, it is Romadanaple who takes all the initiative; Florimont simply follows her lead, and, though he speaks of love, he does not mention marriage (lines 9065-9100). Eventually, it is Floquart who thinks up the stratagem by which King Philip is forced into offering Florimont his daughter's hand (10938-86).

---

(10) Florimont's sense of inferiority is expressed in lines 8125-9.

Curiously enough, at this stage there is still no explicit mention of marriage, even by Floquart; it is as though Florimont's extreme reticence on the subject has affected all his followers. Finally, Florimont is married to Romadanaple without having once expressed the desire to do so.

Thus Florimont can hardly be said to have an attitude towards his marriage at all, for Aimon tells us virtually nothing about his hero's views on the subject. Yet, although Florimont never states that marriage is his goal, it is clear that he does not simply want a temporary affair with Romadanaple. His tutor assumes that marriage must be his aim, and Florimont himself does finally take the action suggested by Floquart to push Philip into arranging the match (the feigned departure, lines 10989-11082). Florimont's association with Romadanaple is, in fact, an extreme example of the way in which a hero who hopes to marry his beloved may nevertheless be shown to think and speak only of love, and virtually to ignore the subject of marriage.

In Florimont, where the heroine is a princess and the hero so destitute that he calls himself Li Povres Perdus (lines 4015-9476, passim), the relative social situations of hero and heroine are the opposite of those found in Floire et Blanchefleur. Since this question of rank is, as we shall see, of some importance for our study, let us look at a third possible combination : a romance in which the hero and heroine are of equal status. Such a situation is found in Durmart le Galois, where both the chief protagonists

are of royal blood (11).

Like Floire, Durmart sets out on a quest for his beloved. Again like Floire, he does not say whether he hopes to marry her once he has found her. At the outset of the quest, he speaks of his desire to find the queen of Ireland and offer her his love-service; the two motives which inspire him to seek adventure in Ireland are his eagerness to make his name as a knight, and his love for the mysterious queen (1189-94, 1309-30). He does not say what he expects the outcome of his love to be; having succeeded in his quest, does he intend to marry the beautiful queen or not? The author does not think it necessary for Durmart to be specific on this point. It is enough for Durmart to say that he loves her, and that he will undertake the dangerous search for her.

Once engaged in his lonely adventure, Durmart often has leisure in which to muse on the paragon who is the object of his quest (3655-80, 4090-4111, 4142-5, 5142-5204, 8835-58, 8948-9073, 10354-64, 10701-34, 11549-90, 13686-96, 13711-6). On such occasions, his thoughts again centre on love and renown; he contemplates Fenise's perfections and longs to prove himself worthy of this haute amor by his feats of prowess. Yet, though he dreams more than once of embracing Fenise in bed (4095-4102, 9067-8), in all his musings there is only one reference to marriage (lines 9056-62, quoted below, p. 126 ). Again, when asking for

---

(11) This equality of birth is stressed by the author of Durmart; see lines 860-70, 1149-52, and 14870-74.



news of Fenise, he does not once describe himself as an aspirant for her hand, but only as her lover and her knight, or simply as one who is curious to see such a rare beauty (1606-18, 1963-72, 3942-64, 5316-24, 6367-79). Even when, his quest at last accomplished, Durmart finally asks Fenise to marry him, his proposal is couched in terms of love alone, and he does not use the word marriage:

14809      Dame, donés moi quitement  
              Tot vostre cors entierement  
              Et vostre amor sens repentie,  
              Si arai la plus bele amie  
 14813      Et la millor qui soit vivans;  
              A tos jors mais serai joians  
              Se je puis si bial don avoir.

Were it not for the references to the permanence of the don (sens repentie, a tos jors mais), these lines might almost be taken to mean that Durmart has no thought of marrying Fenise, but simply wants to engage in a temporary love-affair like the one he has already enjoyed with the seneschal's wife (149-702).

Nevertheless, we know that, from the very start of his search, Durmart does indeed hope to make Fenise his bride. The pilgrim whose description first fires him to undertake the quest has informed him that Fenise is unmarried (1141), and that a union between them would be very suitable (1149-52). Durmart, however, does not comment on this information, and it is left to his father Jozefant to tell us, almost by chance, that his son's interest in such an eligible young woman necessarily implies

matrimony. When Durmart announces his intention of setting out to find the Irish queen and offer her his love, his father tries to dissuade him from so dangerous a project with an alternative suggestion :

1333 "Bealz filz, fait il, en tot[e] Yrlande  
 Qui si par est et large et grande  
 Ne sai roïne a marier,  
 S'a vostre cors le vuel mander,  
 1337 Que lués ne vos soit envoïe.  
 Mar en ferés chevalerie." (12).

If Durmart objects to this proposition, it is not because he does not see the unknown beauty as a roïne a marier; Jozefant's assumption that his son hopes to marry this new love is, indeed, the right one, and it is only the idea that he should forego the chance of winning her by chevalerie to which Durmart objects (1339-43). His quest for Fenise is, from the outset, a quest for a bride.

To confirm that Durmart's intentions are matrimonial, we have a second passing reference to marriage, this time from Durmart himself. At a late stage in his quest, when he is almost on the threshold of Fenise's kingdom, Durmart reflects on the whole course of his love for her, and on the length of time since he last saw her, during which he may have lost her for good :

---

(12) The suggestion by Durmart's father is, of course, an example of the way in which a marriage might well be arranged by a father for his son, with little thought for the consent of the bride.

9056      Mes cuers se dote mout et crient  
             De ce que n'aiés pris mari  
             Puis l'ore que je me parti  
             De vostre doche compaignie.  
 9060      Bien sera ma joie fallie  
             Se donee estes a nului  
             Fors moi qui vostres liges sui.

Here it is quite clear that Durmart wants to marry Fenise. If she is married to another, he will miss the joy he aims at; there is no question here of his seeking his joie in an adulterous liaison, as he did with the seneschalcesce. Moreover, it seems as though, having declared himself her liege knight, Durmart feels that he almost has a right to marry Fenise; and it is interesting to note that this allegiance dates from the very beginning of his quest for her ("Si m'a conquis que ses hom sui", 1350; "Ge sui ses liges chevaliers", 1613) (13).

We therefore have in Durmart yet another hero who, though he sets out to win a bride, and eventually succeeds in his aim, makes only one explicit reference to the fact that marriage is his goal. The rest of the time, he thinks and speaks only of love, even when he wants to ask the heroine to be his wife. As with Floire and Florimont, we have to search for clues which will tell us whether or not the hero hopes that his love will lead to marriage, and the information is provided in an incidental way, by the chance remarks of other characters or of the hero himself.

---

(13) Durmart is also described as Fenise's liege man in lines 1736 and 5177.

The cases of Floire, Florimont and Durmart are but three instances of the different ways in which the heroes of romances which end in a wedding often ignore the subject of marriage, and think and act as though love were their only objective. Other examples are not hard to find, as a brief survey of some other romances, taken in roughly chronological order, will show.

In the Paris ms. of Ille et Galeron, the young Ille does not think of the benefits which he might gain through marrying the sister and heir of the duke of Brittany, but only of the joy of winning her love (14). His concern is that love between people of different rank is impossible, rather than that marriage is out of the question in such conditions (902-12, 1210-20, 1309-72). Eventually the marriage is brought about by Galeron's brother, with Ille taking even less initiative in the arrangement than Florimont does in somewhat similar circumstances (1408-1525). There are only two small indications that Ille has previously hoped to marry Galeron. Gautier himself links the apparent impossibility of the marriage with the impossibility of Ille's enjoying Galeron's love :

913    Com avroit il de li soulas,  
          N'ele, qui est li suer au duc,  
          Com avroit le fil Eliduc?

---

(14) Most of the passages describing the emotions of Ille and Galeron before they are married are omitted from the version of the romance conserved in the Wollaton Hall ms. See F. A. G. Cowper's edition (SATF vol.89) lines 560-90 and 757-925; and p.xxxiii of the Introduction to the edition. The Paris ms., which appears to represent a version of Ille produced by Gautier himself for a different patron (Cowper p.xxxiv), was edited by W. Foerster in 1891.

The second indication is still more tenuous, since it rests on a particular shade of meaning which might be given to the verb covoitier in the following passage :

1312        Mout ai en fol liu mon cuer mis;  
              Car se li dus s'apercevoit  
              De sa seror que je covoit,  
              Trestot mon service en perdroie.

It might be argued that covoitier in this context means "want for a wife", though the verb does not have such connotations elsewhere in the romance (15). There is certainly no other suggestion that Ille's love for Galeron leads him to think of her as a future wife (16).

Yvain, before his marriage to Laudine, is made miserable by the thought that his love is not likely to be reciprocated. He does not, however, give one recorded thought to the fact that the barrier to love is also a barrier to marriage (1360-1563, 1974-2039). His mind runs on love alone, and it is left to Laudine and Lunete to raise the subject of marriage, and find a way round the awkward matter of Esclados' death (1593-1879, 2035-2151).

The young Amadas, love-sick for the disdainful Ydoine, does not once suggest, either in his private reveries or when addressing Ydoine herself, that he would like to marry her if only she would return his love (243-1057). Nor does he mention marriage after she has relented; instead, full of gratitude, he sets out, as she has commanded, to win renown in battles and tournaments (1213-1672).

---

(15) See lines 1382-3.

(16) In contrast, Ille definitely hopes that his love for Ganor will lead to marriage; see lines 5357 ff. (4446 ff. of the SA'F edition).

Although these passages give us much detailed description of Amadas' thoughts and feelings, they contain no mention of marriage. Yet, when Amadas learns that Ydoine is betrothed to the count of Nevers, his reaction makes it clear that he has hoped to marry her himself:

1779      Comment? s'avra ma belle amie  
             Nus hom vivant en sa baillie  
             Entre ses bras et g'i faurai  
             Qui par long tans amee l'ai!  
 1783      S'avra autre seigneur de moi!

There is again no suggestion in the early courtship of Guillaume de Palerne that he would like to marry the princess Melior, even though - as with so many other heroes - we learn a good deal about his emotions when under the sway of Amor (lines 1118-1339 & 1466-1562), and although he and Melior have a fairly long association at her father's court (1778-1784). In this case, it is the heroine herself who first mentions marriage, assuming - rightly - that Guillaume will not reject her (2855-67).

In Meraugis de Portlesquez, the hero quarrels with his friend Gorvain over Lidoine in a debate where each asserts the right to love her, yet neither mentions marriage (516-653). Indeed, Meraugis manages to avoid the subject of marriage almost entirely - a not inconsiderable feat in a romance where he vindicates his right to the love of a most eligible woman against a friend and a foe, both of whom expect to marry her. Meraugis is not a work in which there seems to be simply no question of

marriage; Lidoine's hand is definitely sought by Espinogre, and promised to Gorvain, yet the man who finally wins her does not, apparently, bring up the subject of marriage at all. Indeed, one cannot be certain that Meraugis and Lidoine do in fact marry at the end, since there is no mention of a wedding nor of a betrothal. Meraugis has, however, won Lidoine from Belchis and Espinogre, who wanted to marry her into their family, and has also supplanted Gorvain, to whom Lidoine had promised her hand and her kingdom : the inevitable corollary seems to be that Meraugis will marry Lidoine himself.

Guillaume le Clerc's Fergus depicts yet another hero who sets out on a quest for the girl he loves, and eventually marries her. Yet Fergus does not say whether he hopes to marry Galiene once he has found her; even Galiene's uncle is left in the dark about the young man's intentions towards his niece (p.69, l.37 - p.76, l.29). The dwarf who tells Fergus how to succeed in his quest is no better informed (p.101, l.25 - p.105, l.27), and Fergus' own occasional reveries are devoid of any reference to marriage (p.84, ll.16-27; p.106, ll.1-13; p.115, ll.27-30; p.120, l.24-p.121, l.3). As often happens, it is only the presence of a rival which provokes the hero to express an interest in marrying the heroine, though, in the case of Fergus, even this allusion to marriage is not altogether explicit (p.159, ll.8-11; see also p.158, ll.32-5). Moreover, even when he has conquered his rival, Fergus does not claim Galiene's hand (p.162, l.1-p.163, l.21), but has to be lured from hiding by a tournament and persuaded by

Arthur himself, before the wedding finally takes place (p.170, l.23 - p.171, l.3; p.185, l.28 - p.188, l.3).

Fergus' reluctance to propose to Galiene is caused by a justifiable belief that he has offended her too grievously to be accepted (p.165, ll.7-13). Guy of Warwick, however, has no such excuse for his failure to claim the hand of the haughty Felice. Admittedly, the description of his love-sickness does not make clear whether Guy would like to marry Felice or not (Guy de Warewic, ll.215-332 & 373-567), but she herself evidently understands that he hopes to be more successful than the many potential husbands she has already refused (70-74 and 353-60). Yet, if one assumes, like Felice, that Guy would indeed like to marry her, his subsequent behaviour appears rather puzzling. At the behest of Felice, he goes to win renown in continental tournaments (685 ff.); on his return, he asks for her love - not for her hand (1041-54). Sent off again to become the most famous knight in the world, Guy appears to forget Felice altogether, and it is not until he is on the point of marrying another girl that he remembers her (4225-40). Thus, even though he eventually does marry Felice, Guy seems to have remarkably little sense of urgency about the matter. It must be said, however, that Guy's interest in another woman, even if it is only a temporary forgetting of his true love, does set him apart from the other heroes I have mentioned (17).

Perhaps the most curious instance of a hero's reticence on the subject of marriage is that of Kay, in Escanor. Kay goes to a

---

(17) The examples of heroes who contemplate marriage to a girl other than the one they love are discussed below, in Part III, chapter 3.



tournament at which the prize is to be the hand of the king of Northumberland's daughter and heir, Andrivete. At first sight of the princess, Kay falls in love with her, and thinks how lucky he would be if he could win her (3100-62). During the tournament, his mind constantly turns to his love (3326-60, 3781-3805, 4042-53, 4265-4312, 4709-29, 4932-46, 5138-60, 5688-94, 5765-73), and even, on a few occasions, to the thought of marriage (3127-32, 4313-23); when he is wounded and unable to continue fighting, it is quite clear that he longs to have Andrivete for his wife (5932-87). Yet he cannot summon up the courage to say a single word on the subject, either to Andrivete's father or to the princess herself. Everyone concerned is expecting Kay to make some sort of declaration (6613-6725), yet he finally leaves Northumberland without having spoken to anybody of his desire to marry Andrivete (6761-78). Only much later does the marriage take place (18).

---

(18) This episode is not simply another instance of the kind of comic débauche associated with Kay in so many Arthurian romances; in fact Girart d'Amiens, the author of Escanor, intends Kay to be seen as an exemplary lover. As J. D. Bruce comments in The Evolution of Arthurian Romance (Göttingen, 1928) vol. II, p.284 : "It was a happy thought to represent Arthur's seneschal, the scoffer and braggart, in the rôle of a lover ... It seems, however, that the comic possibilities of the situation never even suggested themselves to Gerard. A slave, like his predecessors, to the conventions of the amour courtois, he exploits his invention simply to exemplify anew the power of love."

Thus we see that, in twelfth and thirteenth-century Old French romances, there are many different heroes who can be said to have marriage as their goal, and yet who, in various ways, are made to behave as though they in fact had little interest in marrying. Obviously, this attitude is not typical of all heroes whose love ends in marriage. I have drawn attention to some of the most notable exceptions on p. 115, n.1; their number is limited. In the majority of those romances where the marriage of the hero to the heroine is a significant feature, the hero himself is frequently depicted as paying scant attention to marriage.

How are we to account for this paradoxical indifference? It seems to me that there are several complementary explanations.

The first is simply that the authors of Old French romances were not themselves particularly interested in marriage, and did not expect their audiences to find the subject engrossing either. For the literate society of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the topic of consuming interest was the freshly-discovered wonderland of romantic love. Marriage was a dull subject when compared with the excitement of an emotion whose possibilities were, at first, those of a new-found land, and which on exploration proved to contain rich mines of new theory and practice, of psychological insight and intricate social behaviour. Fine amor was, moreover, essentially inspired by failure to possess the loved one totally. In the romances, it is typically experienced by a lover who is uncertain that his feelings are reciprocated, or

who is separated from the one he loves. For Andreas Capellanus, the fears and jealousy of the lover, born of his inability to win complete and permanent possession of the beloved, are a necessary condition of love (19). Now, as Andreas stated, a love based on unfulfilment can hardly be experienced by a couple who are husband and wife, for marriage provides them with full mutual possession; love and marriage are therefore incompatible, and lovers who wish to remain in love should not marry each other (20). The writers of romances were not, on the whole, as dogmatic as Andreas; in particular, they often rejected the conclusion that lovers should not get married. Nevertheless, they were aware of the incompatibility between fine amor and the married state. For most of the authors we are concerned with, this meant that marriage must be kept in the background; the hero and heroine must be allowed to marry only near the end of the story, thus maintaining for as long as possible the doubts,

---

(19) De Amore Libri Tres, edited by E. Trojel, second edition, (Munich 1964), pp.4-5 & 154. See Claude Buridant's translation (André le Chapelain, Traité de l'Amour Courtois, Paris 1974), p.47 : "l'amoureux est toujours dans la crainte que sa passion ne puisse aboutir à l'issue souhaitée"; p.48 : "L'amant a également peur d'offenser celle qu'il aime"; p.108 : "sans jalousie, il ne peut y avoir de véritable amour".

(20) De Amore ed. Trojel pp.153-4; Traité de l'Amour Courtois trans. Buridant pp.111-2: "Les époux ... sont tenus par devoir d'obéir réciproquement à leurs volontés et ne peuvent en aucune façon se refuser l'un à l'autre. En outre, les époux ont-ils plus de gloire s'ils s'accordent des caresses à la manière des amants? Les mérites d'aucun d'eux ne s'en trouvent augmentés et ils ne semblent posséder rien de plus que ce qu'ils possédaient de droit auparavant." These views are attributed by Andreas to Marie de Champagne. See also the seventeenth judicium amoris (Trojel p.290; Buridant p.173).

the separations, and the lack of fulfilment and possession, which are so necessary to fine amor (21).

Thus one explanation for heroes' lack of interest in marriage is that the romance-writers and their public were not themselves interested in it, but were interested instead in fine amor. The only aspects of marriage which could have any importance for them were those which related to love, and these were limited by the nature of that love to a mere two or three viewpoints. Marriage could, for instance, be seen as an obstacle to love, or as the distant goal of true lovers; in neither case, however, was there any reason to take more than a superficial, external view of the married state. In stories which ~~were~~ told of the trials of two unmarried lovers, the only thing which could pertinently be said about marriage was that it represented the permanent union for which the lovers yearned. Once this aim was achieved, the story of romantic love was probably over, and audiences were not interested in conjugal affection. We thus arrive at a situation where there is little incentive for authors to make their heroes theorize about marriage; marriage is subordinated to love, and the heroes of romances pay attention to love, rather than to marriage (22).

---

(21) Chrétien is, of course, the great exception here, for in Erec and Yvain he does in fact show what may happen to fins amants who marry each other. The problem in both works, however, is seen rather in terms of the conflict between love, marriage and the pursuit of arms, and not simply of the conflict between fine amor and marriage.

(22) Similar remarks have already been made by other students of Old French romances, as outlined in Part I above, pp.32-4, 36-8, 46.

A second explanation for the failure of so many heroes to give explicit voice to their matrimonial hopes may simply be that writers and public took the matter for granted. The information that the hero was in love, and in love with a very eligible girl, would in itself be enough to tell the contemporary audience that matrimony was the hero's aim, and there was no need for any further emphasis of the point.

The heroine's eligibility is, of course, an important element of this equation. It will be noticed that, with the exception of Blanchefleur, all the heroines of the romances discussed in the preceeding pages are heiresses. They are not only beautiful and unmarried, but also rich. They thus represent the highest prize in the "quête aux épouses" described by Georges Duby in his illuminating article on the status of young, unmarried noblemen, the juvenes or bachelers (23). As Duby shows, only the eldest son could expect his father to diminish the family inheritance by arranging a marriage for him, for a bride must be granted part of the patrimony as her dower (24). The younger sons, unless they went into the Church, had normally only one hope of gaining lands and the regular income they produced : to marry an heiress. Wandering from tournament to tournament in search of renown and amusement,

---

(23) "Dans la France du Nord-Ouest au XIIe siècle : les jeunes dans la société aristocratique", Annales-Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations, XIX (1964) p.842.

(24) Loc. cit. The dower was normally one third of the husband's possessions; see E. Chénon, Histoire générale du droit français public et privé des origines à 1815 (Paris 1926-29), vol.II, p.106; Les Etablissements de St Louis, edited by P. Viollet, (Paris 1881) §§ XV & XVI; Les Anciens Usages d'Anjou, edited by M. A. J. Marnier (Paris 1853) §42.

these young men were also engaged in "la chasse à la fille riche": "L'intention de mariage paraît bien commander tout le comportement du jeune, le pousse à briller au combat, à parader dans les réunions sportives." (p.843). Moreover, as Duby points out, the unmarried juvenes constituted "un corps de poids considérable" in the feudal society of the period and region he discusses (p.836). Not only would the general feudal public be well aware of the existence of the juvenes and of their problems, but, in Duby's view, the juvenes themselves made up "le public par excellence de toute la littérature que l'on appelle chevaleresque, et qui fut sans doute composée avant tout à son usage." (p.844). Such an audience, in whose minds the figure of an heiress would immediately suggest the idea of marriage, would find it inconceivable that the hero of a romance should not want to marry such a heroine. Certainly, there would be no need for the author to spell out the fact that the hero hopes to make the heroine his wife; the audience would immediately jump to the right conclusion on learning of the heroine's status, and any insistence would seem superfluous.

We thus have already found two different ways in which the indifference to marriage displayed by so many heroes can be explained. In one sense, it is a genuine lack of interest, reflecting the lack of interest felt by the author and his audience. On the other hand, in the many works where the heroine is an heiress, the hero's apparent unconcern may in fact be the result of an interest in marriage which is so fundamental

P. 138 is a blank inserted to make up for an error in pagination. No material is missing from the text.

that it literally goes without saying. These two explanations are often complementary : the author, knowing that his basic assumption that the hero wants to marry the heroine will be taken for granted by his audience, is free to spend his time discussing more interesting topics, such as the emotions of the true lover.

There is, however, another way in which the contemporary interest in love rather than marriage, combined with the presence of an heiress as the heroine of so many works, may be seen to account for the hero's apparent indifference. Marrying an heiress was, after all, a property transaction : an arrangement made in order to secure a dowry or an inheritance, or to promote some political interest. Essentially, it had very little to do with love. Yet it seems that even the type of young adventurer described by Georges Duby, for whom an heiress was nothing more than "du beau gibier" (p.843), felt it more seemly to pretend that his hunt was motivated by love rather than by greed. Duby quotes the case of a juvenis whose courtship of the countess of Boulogne is described in these terms : "Ad terram tamen et Boloniensis comitatus dignitatem, veri vel simulati amoris objectu, recuperata ejusdem comitis gratia, aspiravit" (25).

If the juvenes themselves felt such a need to hide their materialistic motives, the authors of romances, in which the heroes were paragons of every virtue the juvenes aspired to,

---

(25) Lambert d'Ardres, Historia comitum Ghisnensium, 93, quoted by Duby, art. cit., p.846.



must have felt an even greater need to make it clear that the heroine is to be married for love, and not for profit. A perfect lover, the hero of a story designed to glorify the transcendent power of fine amor, must not appear like a base fortune-hunter with a purely materialistic interest in marriage. Where the heroine is a rich and noble heiress, the hero who shows too much interest in making her his wife may well appear to be more enamoured of her lands and titles than of her sweet self. It is in order to avoid such suspicion that the hero is made to set his sights at love alone. So long as he concentrates on love, his status as a perfect exponent of the doctrine of fine amor is unimpaired; the purity of his devotion is proved by his very indifference to the making of a profitable marriage.

Thus the hero's tendency to ignore marriage can also be seen to result in part from the author's desire to portray him as an ideal lover, concerned only with the essential merits of his beloved and indifferent to her accidental riches.

In parenthesis, it should be noted that nearly all the heroes who do show a strong interest in marrying the heroine are men who do not stand to make any material gain from their chosen bride. Erec, Galerent, the emperor Conrad, the Manekine's king of Scotland and Laïs in Eracle are all explicit about their desire to marry relatively poor girls (26). These five demonstrate

---

(26) Erec et Enide ll. 647-65, 1309-11; Galeren de Bretagne ll.1740-8, 1827-33; Guillaume de Dole ll.2978-3095; La Manekine ll.1521-1676; Eracle ll.2729-38.

a similar noble indifference to riches, but they do so by marrying girls who are not heiresses, rather than by loving an heiress without seeking to marry her. In their situation, eagerness to get married has the same function as the lack of eagerness shown by the hero whose bride is rich and noble : it proves that he is above material considerations, and that his love is not in any way affected by the prospect of financial loss or gain. ~~The~~ One notable exception here is Guillaume, hero of L'Escoufle, who expresses a strong interest in marrying Aelis and thereby becoming emperor of Rome (27). As we shall see in a later chapter, this frankness about the material benefits of marriage, though typical of Jean Renart's extremely personal, ironic view of life, is rather embarrassing to him in his portrayal of Guillaume as a noble and disinterested hero.

Returning to the large group of romances where the heroine is an heiress and where the hero appears indifferent to marriage, we find that, in many of them, there is an additional reason for the hero's apparent lack of interest, apart from the the concern to separate mercenary from amorous motivation. Such heroes are often placed by the author in a social position where it would seem unrealistic for them to expect to marry the heroine. She is a great lady, and the hero is, or appears to be, a poor knight whose only claim to her consideration is his personal merit; it would be sheer presumption for him to envisage becoming his lady's lord.

---

(27) L'Escoufle 11. 2646-7, 3026-61, 3398-3401, 3488-3519. Floire is, of course, an exception in a different sense, for he shows little interest in marrying Blanchefleur even though she is not rich.

This, as we have seen, is the consideration which restrains Ille from asking Conain for the hand of his sister Galeron (28). Florimont is similarly inhibited by the high status of Romadanaple :

C'ele fust de petit paraige,  
 Bien li deïsse mon coraige;  
 Mai ele est de tel signorie  
 Qu'a moi n'ataint de tele amie,  
 C'ele meïsmes ne s'i done. (8125-9)

Another example is Philippe de Remi's Jehan, who, though somewhat bolder than Ille or Florimont, is also held back at first by an awareness of his own inferiority :

553      Se la contesse s'aperchoit  
           Ne li quens que ainsi me soit,  
           N'ele aussi qui je doi servir,  
           Mal porai lor gre desservir.  
 557      Il me tenront a fol musart,  
           Si me baniront sur le hârt;  
           Et bien sai qu'il n'en poront mais,  
           Car si folement n'ama mais  
 561      Nus hom comme je voel amer.

The reaction of Guillaume de Palerne, the foundling, is stronger than any of these; he is horrified at his own presumption in daring even to dream of the princess Melior, and resolves not to give way any longer to such imprudent folly (1184-1240).

---

(28) See lines 913-5 of the Foerster edition, quoted above, p. 127.

There is a fair number of romances of this type, where the hero is inferior to the heroine in either rank or wealth, or both : Amadas, Le Bel Inconnu, Blancandin, Claris et Laris, Cligès, Cristal et Clarie, Eneas, L'Escoufle, Fergus, Florimont, Guillaume de Palerne, Guy de Warewic, Ille et Galeron, Ipomedon, Jehan et Blonde, Partonopeus, Protheselaus, and Yder are those which come within the terms of the present study (29). Not all the heroes of these romances appear to find their lower status inhibiting, but there are several cases, apart from those already mentioned, where it seems likely that a sense of his own unworthiness does indeed contribute to the hero's reticence on the subject of matrimony (30). In such instances, the author's concern with presenting a plausible pattern of behaviour dictates the hero's apparent lack of interest in marriage.

Finally, there are a few works in which it is possible that the hero's failure to press for the heroine's hand may be linked with the fact that he is able to sleep with her without first being

---

(29) The hero's inferiority may of course be only apparent; in many of these works, the hero is in fact the heroine's equal, but has set out alone on his adventures and thus appears at her court as a poor and unknown young man. Such deliberate manipulation of the plot in order to create an inferiority of the man where none exists testifies to the popularity of the situation in literature - a popularity no doubt influenced by the existence in real life of a whole class of just such poor, wandering knights, the juvenes. (30) Although there is no explicit statement that the hero is inhibited, it seems probable that such is the case in Amadas, Le Bel Inconnu, Ipomedon, and Partonopeu, works in which the hero is particularly conscious of his own unworthiness. Similarly, Marie's Guigemar hesitates to declare his love because of insecurity about his status as a foreigner (lines 477-80). Kay, in Escanor, is inhibited for a different reason: he fears that a declaration would embarrass Andrivete (3141-9).

married to her. Although there is no strong evidence for this explanation, it may perhaps account, if only in part, for the readiness of Floire, Cligès, the Bel Inconnu, Partonopeus or Cristal to be content with having a love-affair with the girl of their choice, instead of seeking the more permanent union of matrimony.

We can therefore find five possible ways of accounting for the general indifference to marriage shown by so many heroes of Old French romances, even in the very works where matrimony appears to be the goal. Firstly, the authors and their public were not themselves very interested in marriage as a subject for literature. They were, on the other hand, extremely interested in love. This love was, almost by definition, the love of people who were not married to each other, since one of its essential components was the lack of that very certainty of possession which marriage provided. The lover might - indeed, must - yearn for the security of marriage, but only as a distant goal : there was no occasion for him to give any more thought to the subject than this vague longing, and the bulk of his soliloquies must be devoted to love.

However, even the fact that marriage is the lover's goal is often omitted. It seems that, particularly in the many romances where the heroine is an heiress, it would have been superfluous to make a point of such self-evident information; knowing the eagerness with which heiresses were sought as brides, audiences would automatically assume that the hero who loved such

a girl must want to marry her.

A third reason for the hero's apparent lack of interest springs from the combined effects of these first two. Audiences were eager to hear about the emotions of the ideal lover, and at the same time, they knew that 'love' for an heiress was often a disguise for plain fortune-hunting. In order to maintain his hero's status as a perfect fin amant, the author tended to emphasise love for the heroine as an end in itself, independent of any desire to marry her and thus gain control of her wealth and titles.

Fourthly, several heroes who are of lower rank than the girls they love make it clear that they dare not think of suggesting marriage to such noble women. It would, indeed, seem unrealistic if an author made his impoverished hero seek the hand of someone he could obviously not expect to win.

Lastly, a few heroes are able to sleep with the girls they love without first being married to them, and it is possible that this provides them with an additional reason for failing to take any steps towards actually winning them as brides.

Having seen how seldom it is that the hero, in the type of romance we are dealing with, appears to take a positive interest in his own marriage, we must now try to discover what his attitude is on the few occasions when he does give the subject some attention.

One can summarize the attitude of most of these heroes by saying that it is a curious mixture of the ideal and the real, of practicality and perfectionism. The majority are victims of the conflict between the ideal of marriage for love, and the practical view of marriage as a means of gaining prestige or wealth, of cementing alliances or rewarding faithful vassals. This conflict is seldom fully resolved; in most of our romances, the two views exist side by side, and the author who has just celebrated the joys of marrying for love will turn immediately, and with no apparent sense of inconsistency, to praise his hero for arranging "political" matches for his followers.

However, the "ideal" aspect of this dual view is probably the stronger. It is also the one which most easily seems to go without saying. In many cases, the hero's silence on the topic of marriage disguises his most fundamental belief : that love and marriage "go together". The hero expects that, where possible, love should lead to marriage, and generally rejects both marriage to someone he does not love, and love for someone he is not going to marry.

We shall be looking separately at these two possible cases where love and marriage do not go together. First, however, let us consider the great majority of heroes of the romances under study here, who expect their love for the heroine to last for ever, and who seek to fulfil it in the permanent, indissoluble union of matrimony.

As we have seen, most authors expect their readers to take it for granted that the hero will want to marry the heroine, provided she is a suitable match. Fundamentally, it is assumed that almost any hero worthy of the name will love his sweetheart strongly enough to want to spend the rest of his life with her (31), and this, where she is a marriageable girl, means that he will want to marry her. Yet all too often, in the works we are concerned with, this assumption is so much taken for granted that it is difficult to find any direct evidence that the hero does indeed aim at marriage. The prologue, where one might expect authors to summarize the hero's life and to include the fact that he marries his lady, is usually silent on this point. Indeed, of the romances chosen for this study, only two have prologues which convey the information that the hero marries in the course of the tale. These are Floire et Blanchefleur and Florimont. In both cases, the information that the hero is to marry in the course of the story is conveyed in the same way : we are told that the hero was the father of certain famous people, and from this it is reasonable to assume that we are to learn, among other things, about the hero's marriage. Thus we know that Floire and Blanchefleur were the parents of Berte aus Granz Piez (lines 7-18) and that

---

(31) Exceptions to this generalisation occur in works which lie outside the terms of this study, such as Joufroi de Poitiers and the more episodic Arthurian romances. In addition, the heroes of the romans d'antiquité sometimes enjoy temporary love-affairs, in accordance with the facts given by the classical author, whether Virgil or Dares the Phrygian. The dedicated love of Tristan or of Chrétien's Lancelot, however, is unmistakeably that of a hero who aspires to spend his whole life in the service of a single lady.



Florimont's descendents were Philip of Macedon and Alexander the Great (lines 103-110). Apart from these two cases, the prologues of the romances studied here give little or no biographical information about the hero, and certainly do not mention the fact of his marriage. Altogether, our authors seem to have little to say about marriage where the hero is concerned, and this creates a situation in which the hero's intentions may have to be deduced from circumstantial evidence, because the author has not felt it necessary to state them explicitly.

Such indirect evidence of the hero's intentions is often provided by minor characters in the romance concerned. Such minor characters, like the authors themselves, assume that love must lead to marriage; however, unlike the author, they make their assumptions explicit. Thus the author of the "version aristocratique" of Floire et Blanchefleur does not directly tell us that Floire would like to marry Blanchefleur, but the information is nevertheless conveyed through the hero's father, who sees marriage as the inevitable conclusion of his son's love for Blanchefleur (lines 289-300, 658-661). The emir, too, after hearing Floire's account of the course of his love, concludes that marriage must be the young man's aim, and takes the couple off to a moustier (2835-94). A similar situation arises in Durmart, where, as we have seen (above, pp. 124-5), it is the hero's father who tells us, incidentally, that his son hopes to marry the Irish queen. Here again, the information

about the hero's aims rests, at least in part, on the assumption that true love must lead to marriage, for all Jozefant actually knows is that Durmart loves the mysterious queen, and that she is :

1313      ... la mieldrë et la plus bele  
             Qui soit ne dame ne pucelle. (32).

Lunete, too, having divined Yvain's love, immediately concludes that he would like to marry her mistress, and sets about converting Laudine to the idea of this new husband (1588-1611 and later, passim).

In Florimont, on the other hand, it is the heroine herself who reveals the hero's reason for taking service with her father :

5643      ... Bien sai et voi  
             Que il est si verus por moi.

We know, moreover, from other circumstances, that the union of the hero and heroine is bound to take place. This is shown by the two prophetic dreams of Florimont's marriage to Romadanaple (1485-1526 and 1713-1846), by king Phelipe's own recognition of Florimont as the man who will win his war and marry his daughter (5610-4, 7277-81), and by the fact that Florimont's love for Romadanaple ousts from his heart the memory of the Pucele de l'Ile Selee, whom he had hoped to marry.

---

(32) The qualities of Fenise as an ideal bride are also important in determining Jozefant's view of Durmart's intentions towards her. The hero's earlier, degrading love for the wife of the seneschal clearly did not have marriage as its goal, since the girl concerned was obviously not someone he could marry.

Romadanaple is far from being the only heroine who simply assumes that the hero must want to marry her, even though he has not said so himself. In many other romances, it is a similar assumption on the part of the heroine which shows us that the hero's talk of love can in fact be taken to mean that he would like to be her husband. Melior, in Guillaume de Palerne, does not doubt that her lover will be delighted when she tells him she will marry no-one but him, and Guillaume's joy and gratitude confirm that such a union is indeed his dearest wish (2852-81). Ydoine is so sure that Amadas wants to marry her, even though he has not in fact said so, that she organises a form of betrothal ceremony, giving him her ring and taking his in exchange (1262-92).(33). The first - and, for a long time, the only - information we have about the matrimonial intentions of Guy of Warwick comes, as we have noted, from Felice, who takes it for granted that, when the young Guy asks for her love, what he really hopes for is her hand in marriage (351-60 and 70-74; see above, p. 131 ).

Perhaps the most striking example of this tendency for the heroine to be the mouthpiece of the hero's expectation that love should end in marriage occurs in Gliglois. During Gliglois' early courtship of Biauté, there is no mention of marriage; as so often happens, the hero thinks only of earning the heroine's love, and does not say what he plans to do once he has won it. But Biauté

---

(33) For a fuller discussion of this exchange of rings, accompanied by a kiss, as a genuine betrothal, see below, Pt IV, c.1. Betrothal ceremonies are described by E. Chénon, "Recherches Historiques sur Quelques Rites Nuptiaux", Nouvelle Revue Historique de Droit Français et Etranger XXXVI (1912) pp.573-604 ; see also pp. 59-61 above.

herself, knowing only that he is devoted to her, decides to marry him, and proceeds to announce her decision, first to her sister (1710-33) and later, with Gliglois actually present, to Guenevere (2805-10), without having previously discussed marriage with Gliglois himself on any occasion. His declarations of love are taken as ample proof in themselves that he would like to be her husband.

Only in the last lines of the romance does a chance remark of the author's suggest that Gliglois' goal has indeed been marriage all along. Having described the couple's formal betrothal and Gliglois' subsequent return to his own lodgings (2892-2900), the author tells us that :

2903      Gliglois mainne molt riche vie  
             Qu'aseürés est de s'amie,  
             Bien a tout son mal trespasé.  
             Amors li a gueredonné  
 2907      Tout le grant mal qu'il a souffert.

Thus Gliglois' suggerings in love's service are all amply rewarded once he has been given the solemn assurance, through the betrothal vows he and Biauté have just exchanged, that the girl he loves will be his bride. Since the romance ends at this point, after an exhortation to other lovers to follow Gliglois' example (2908-41), there can be no doubt that Gliglois' reward, the goal of his love-service, is not simply the physical satisfaction of his passion, which presumably he does not achieve until after the wedding. Instead, he is fully rewarded by being "aseürés ... de

s'amie" through betrothal (34). Although the prospect of the physical consummation of the wedding-night doubtless contributes to Gliglois' happiness, it is not in itself the reward he seeks, for he is gueredonné by Amors on the exchange of the verba de futuro, the binding betrothal vows which constitute the first stage in the formation of the contract of matrimony. Gliglois' courtship, in other words, was undertaken with the sole aim of marrying Biauté, and the young lady herself presumably understood from the outset that marriage was her suitor's unspoken goal. Once again, the hero's conduct is based on the assumption that love should lead to marriage; once again, this assumption is taken by the author to be so self-evident that it can be left unexplained until the end of the story (35).

There are, however, some works in which the hero does make his hopes of marriage clear from the start. We have already mentioned L'Escoufle, and the works in which the heroine is of lower rank than the hero. In Escanor, too, we have seen how Kay, on his first meeting with Andrivete, thinks how lucky he would be

---

(34) The binding nature of betrothal vows (verba de futuro) at this period is discussed above, pp. 59-60. As can be seen from the examples cited in TL I, 590-591, the verb asseürer is often used to describe an assurance given by taking an oath or swearing a vow.

(35) It is particularly interesting to find that marriage is assumed to be the goal of love in a work like Gliglois, which appears to be strongly influenced by the Provençal idea of love; Gliglois' patient love-service, and Biauté's pride and cruelty, lead one to expect a clandestine affair with a haughty domna, rather than a church wedding.

if he could have her as his bride :

3127      Mais s'or fust tele sa cheance  
             qu'il eust senz et pourveance  
             que la pucele avoir peust, (36)  
             si eureuz el mont n'eust  
 3131      n'a qui avemu fust si bien!

One of the heroes of Clariss et Laris is similarly explicit about his intentions. Laris loves Yvain's sister, Marine, and reveals his feelings to his companion Claris, adding :

15237      Bien vous di, ou je l'averai,  
             Ou de dolor enragerai.

Clariss' reassuring reply shows that he clearly understands averai in this context to mean "marry" :

15262      Et je croi tant faire et ouvrier,  
             Que je vous ferai espouser  
             Marine, la gente pucele.

Philippe de Remi's Jehan is another hero who tells us from the outset that marriage is his aim, although he does so in a rather roundabout way. Having reflected on the folly of his love for

---

(36) Tobler-Lommatzsch gives only two examples of avoir in the sense of "zum Gemahl haben" (vol.I, col.761, 1.37), as against four instances of avoir used to denote physical intercourse ("[ein Weib] zu willen haben"). Godefroi does not record the sense of "épouser" for avoir at all. In my experience, avoir is very frequently used to mean "marry" in Old French; see, for example, Cligès 2944-8, Le Bel Inconnu 2205-8 and 2376-7, Guillaume de Palerne 2686, and Clariss et Laris 16299-16307.

Blonde, he continues :

562      Et bien me doi pour fol clamer  
             Qui aime en lieu dont ja mus biens  
             Ne me devra venir pour riens.  
             Se li rois n'avoit point de fame,  
 566      Il penroit volentiers ma dame.

The transition from the idea of Jehan's gaining no benefit from his love to that of Blonde marrying the king seems to be based on the fact that the biens Jehan hopes to win through love is his own marriage to Blonde.

The very allusiveness of Jehan's remarks reminds us yet again that, for many heroes, the connexion between love and eventual marriage is too obvious to need any expression. There is, however, one work which clearly formulates the unspoken belief, acted upon by so many heroes, that love should lead to marriage. This is the early thirteenth-century Durmart le Galois, whose author had evidently given considerable thought to the matter. His argument is worth quoting at length, since it makes so explicit the connexion between love and marriage from the hero's point of view (37). Speaking of the marriage of Durmart and Fenise, he says:

---

(37) This passage is also singled out by S. F. Barrow in The Medieval Society Romances, pp.65-6, but without any specific comment apart from the conclusion that the work as a whole shows the ideal relationship between love and society. J. Coppin, in Amour et mariage dans la Litterature Francaise du Nord au Moyen Age, pp.71-2, sees this passage as the theory behind the general preference for love leading to marriage in Northern French literature of the period.

14990 Or est bien lor joie afermee;  
 Plus seür sont et plus joiant  
 Qu'il n'eüssent esté devant.  
 L'uns ne puet mais l'atre faillir,  
 14994 Se mors ne les fait departir.  
 Li plusor blasment et reprennent  
 Tos ceaz qui lor amies prenent,  
 Mais ne sont pas d'amors sopris.  
 14998 Certes, n'en doit estre repris  
 Fins amans qui s'amie prent;  
 Je di que cil qui l'en reprent  
 A le cuer felon et amer,  
 15002 Car fins amans doit plus amer  
 La joie qui li est donee  
 Que celi qui li est prestee.  
 Cil est en perilleuz dangier  
 15006 Qui s'amie n'a a moillier,  
 Car uns autres li puet tolir  
 Et devant lui prendre et saisir  
 Et esposer devant ses iex.  
 15010 Tot li sage ameroient miex  
 C'uns beaz avoirs lor fust donés  
 Qu'i[l]lor fust par dangier prestés.  
 Qui s'amie prent a moillier  
 15014 Il ne le vuet pas eslongier  
 Ains le prent por avoir todis,  
 Et si en vuet estre saisis  
 Et sa joie si affermer  
 15018 Qu'altre n'i puist nul droit clamer.  
 Qui s'amie voit devant lui  
 Baisier et acoler autrui  
 Et faire trestos ses desduis  
 15022 Ce li senble trop grans emuis,  
 S'il aime bien de cuer entier;  
 Dont doit fins amans convoitier  
 Qu'il ait s'amie quitement  
 15026 En sa baillie fermement.  
 Certes fins amans n'est il mie  
 Qui renfuse a prendre s'amie,  
 N'a amie nel tient il pas  
 15030 Cant il ne li ne son solas  
 Ne vuet prendre sens departir;  
 Il n'en a mie grant desir.

Thus the author of Durmart declares that the desire for marriage  
 is an essential element of true love, since it is nothing other  
 than the desire to be constantly with one's beloved. The  
 indissoluble marriage-bond gives the lover sure possession of his  
 most highly-prized treasure, and protects him from the fate of  
 those who - like Tristan - suffer the trop grans emuis of knowing



that the woman they love is in the arms of another man. Hence the fin amant must, by definition, desire to make his amie his wife; if he does not, it is because he does not in fact love her.

Although the writer of this passage refers to li plusor who criticize lovers for marrying their amies, there is little trace of such a view among the heroes of the romances we are concerned with (38). Rather, they tend to follow the principle set out by the author of Durmart : as true lovers, they long to have the girl they love with them always, and dread the possibility of her being given to another man. In a word, they see marriage as their goal. Most of our authors, moreover, find it so improbable that any genuine lover should not want to marry his sweetheart, that they see no need to state explicitly that this is the hero's aim - unless, of course, the heroine's circumstances are such as to make the marriage a mésalliance and give the hero good grounds for hesitation. With the majority, however, that very lack of information about the hero's intentions, which might well lead one to suppose that marriage is far from his mind, is in fact a striking indication of the extent to which it was taken for granted among authors and their public that marriage was the right, true end of love.

---

(38) The view that it is a mistake for lovers to marry each other is found elsewhere in Old French literature, and notably in the jeux-partis. In the Recueil Général des Jeux-Partis collected by A. Jeanroy and A. Langfors, two vols, S.A.T.F. (Paris 1926), nos XXII, XL, XLIX, LIV, LXVII, LXXII, LXXVII and CVI present some of the arguments against such marriages, and suggest some other lines which the debate might follow. Andreas Capellanus' De Amore, too, is not generally in favour of love-marriages; in the seventeenth iudicium amoris, for example, a girl who marries her lover is thereby considered to have lost his love and to be free to take another lover.

## Chapter 2. The Hero's Attitude to Love Without Marriage

Having seen how closely the ideas of love and marriage are linked in the minds of many heroes of Old French romances, we should give some consideration to those of the romances chosen for this study in which the hero does not conform to this general pattern. Such exceptions arise when a hero loves a girl he cannot marry, or when he marries a girl whom he does not love.

The first of these possibilities — that of love without marriage — means in practice that the hero's love is adulterous. Only in these circumstances, where he loves a woman whose marriage to another makes it seemingly impossible for him to marry her himself, can a hero truly be said to engage in love without marriage. Heroes like Floire, Partonopeu, Florimont and the Bel Inconnu, who sleep with girls outside wedlock, do not come into this category, since in no case is the girl married, and moreover the hero hopes or intends to marry her himself. This behaviour, therefore, is pre-marital unchastity, and not, strictly speaking, love without marriage. Nevertheless, for convenience' sake, we shall consider pre-marital unchastity as well as adultery in this chapter. I shall use the expression "extra-marital" to refer to adulterous love, to distinguish it from pre-marital love. The opposite type of separation of love and marriage — that of marriage without love — is examined in the following chapter.

### 1). Adultery

Our two principal examples of heroes who choose adulterous love are Cligès and Amadas.<sup>4</sup> In point of fact, these two young men have little choice in the matter, since they both fall in love with girls who marry someone else. Each of them responds to his predicament by suggesting to his lady that they should run away together to a distant land where they could live unmolested, though they would not be married. In the event, both are dissuaded from such a course by their respective amies. Here, however, the similarities end. Amadas and Ydoine do not consummate their love until the annulment of Ydoine's previous marriage allows them to do so legally and honestly, as man and wife. Cligès and Fenice, on the other hand, embark on a secret love-affair which, for all Fenice's concern about her reputation, is nevertheless adulterous. As A. Fourrier puts it : "jusqu'à la mort du mari, les amants eux-mêmes considèrent leurs relations comme illégitimes ... Chrétien se rencontre avec les décisions pontificales en considérant les relations de Fenice avec Cligès comme un adultère." (1).

---

(1) Le Courant Réaliste, vol.I (Paris 1960), pp.176-7. Fourrier considers that the situation of Fenice is a classic example of the "cas épineux de la sponsa duorum ... Un premier mariage non consommé en autorise-t-il un second scellé par la carnalis copulatio?" (loc.cit.). However, this is only one aspect of the extremely complicated legal problems raised by Fenice's marital imbroglio. Moreover, it is not certain that the two men of whom Fenice is the sponsa are indeed, as Fourrier assumes, Alis and Cligès: in twelfth-century canon law, the first sponsus would probably be held to be the Duke of Saxony. Hence Fourrier's analysis of the legal background to Cligès, though useful, is insufficient. Since it is principally Fenice, rather than Cligès, whose rôle gives rise to these complexities, the legal situation will be examined when we come to discuss Cligès from the heroine's point of view (below, chap.3, ~~Part~~ IV). A summary of the law on the sponsa duorum will be found in Part II of the present thesis, pp. 64 - 74 ; see also the sections of Part II on vis, crimen, si coire nequibis and affinitas.

Neither Chrétien nor the author of Amadas seems to have thought it necessary to give his hero moral scruples about a permanent extra-marital union. Cligès does not, apparently, ask himself whether it would be morally right or wrong to set up an establishment in Britain with Fenice, nor whether the Church would condemn such a way of life. His only concern is for the social consequences of their irregular union : will it lead to their being ostracised by Arthur and his court? Fortunately, he is confident that his royal great-uncle will receive the fugitive couple with open arms :

5234      "Dame, fet il, je croi et cuit  
             Que mialz feire ne porriens  
             Que s'an Bretaingne en aliens;  
             La ai pansé que vos an maingne.  
 5328      Or gardez qu'an vos ne remaingne!  
             C'onques ne fu a si grant joie  
             Eleinne reçette a Troie,  
             Quant Paris li ot amenee,  
 5332      Que plus n'en soit de vos menee  
             Par tote la terre le roi,  
             Mon oncle, de vos et de moi.

The parallel with Paris and Helen is, it seems, a particularly apt one for Cligès' purpose. In the second half of the twelfth century, Helen must have been the perfect literary example of a run-away wife who achieved full social respectability amongst her lover's relations. Most readers of Benoit de Sainte-Maure's Roman de Troie, which had popularised the Trojan legend in the courts of Britain and France, would remember the splendid

reception given to Helen in Troy, with its emphasis on precisely that joie which Cligès refers to (Troie 4803-4882). Presumably Chrétien also hoped that his audience would be aware of the way Benoit's Helen became completely accepted into Trojan society, and was indeed, as Priam had promised, its "First Lady", the dame del país (Troie 4852) (2). In short, Helen of Troy seems a particularly felicitous example for Cligès to use in his attempt to persuade Fenice to run away with him to Arthur's court.

The parallel with Helen clearly indicates that, in Cligès' eyes, the chief problem raised by his cohabitation with Fenice in Britain would not be a moral one, but a social one : that of their acceptability at Arthur's court. It is on this point that he particularly seeks to reassure Fenice, as his reference to Helen's reception in Troy indicates. One may, of course, object that any difficulties over their social standing in Britain would only arise because of their immoral relationship, which might excite the reprobation of Arthur's court : the fact remains that Cligès makes no reference to the underlying moral problem, but only to its social consequences.

---

(2) Benoit constantly refers to her as "dame Heleine", and treats her as having more prestige than any other woman in Troy, including Hecuba. See, for example, the Chambre des Beutez episode, Helen's reception of the wounded Hector (14619-21), and the part she plays in various events at Troy - Andromache's dream, Hector's death, the anniversary of Hector's funeral, Briseida's departure, Hecuba's mourning, and so forth. Benoit's desire to "hold up Helen as a model" is also commented on by R. Jones in The Theme of Love in the "Romans d'Antiquité", (London 1972), pp.49-50.

Nor does Cligès show any greater awareness of the immorality of his relations with Fenice during the events which follow his initial suggestion of cohabitation in Britain. He immediately accepts Fenice's counter-suggestion of the fausse morte stratagem, and concentrates on the practical difficulties of executing her plan (5306-36). In conversation with Jehan, he is concerned only with ensuring that their plot is not discovered; his attitude could be described as: "It doesn't matter what we do, so long as we aren't found out" (5424-5576). Even when he learns of the treatment inflicted on Fenice by the Salerno doctors, and later when he believes that his beloved is really dead, it does not occur to Cligès to see his lady's sufferings as any kind of retribution for their immoral proceedings (5970-89, 6139-81).

It is not often noticed how well this amorality on Cligès' part fits in with the attitude of his lady. Fenice, as commentators have pointed out, is not concerned with the morality of her behaviour, but only with her gloire and with the "crainte des jugements du monde" (3). A. Fourrier's remark that "[l']unique frein qu'elle admette, c'est le souci de sa réputation" (4) echoes those of other critics. Yet the fact that Cligès is no more moral

---

(3) G. Paris, Mélanges de Littérature Française du Moyen Age (Paris, 1912), p.292.

(4) Le Courant Réaliste, p.177. See also M. -N. Lefay-Toury, "Roman Breton et Mythes Courtois : l'évolution du personnage féminin dans les romans de Chrétien", CCM XV (1972) p.202, and J. Frappier, Le Roman Breton : Cligès (Cours de Sorbonne, 1951) pp.54-7. Frappier seeks to mitigate the charge of amorality against Fenice on the grounds that she conforms to the "morale ... de l'amour courtois"; this view is opposed by A. Fourrier, who judges Fenice to be not simply amoral, but "coupable". (loc.cit.)

than Fenice is often overlooked, especially as commentators tend to concentrate on the heroine as the instigator of the couple's clandestine life. As a result, many critics either ignore Cligès' suggestion altogether, or treat it as being merely inept: "Cligès ne semble pas s'être mis martel en tête : tout ce qu'il trouve à proposer, c'est un enlèvement," comments A. Fourrier (5).

However, after thus seeking to demonstrate Cligès' amorality, we must not neglect a further possibility : that his reference to Paris and Helen is, in fact, a veiled moral comment on the situation of himself and Fenice. This possibility is suggested by the one great difference between the lovers of antiquity and Chrétien's heroes : Paris and Helen, being pagans, are able to marry (6). At first sight, it appears as if this fundamental difference in matrimonial status must make the parallel with the classical lovers quite useless from Cligès' point of view. Fenice could so easily object that the example of Helen is irrelevant to her own case, since Helen was married to her lover and therefore ran no risk of incurring any social stigma in her new homeland. Why does Chrétien allow his hero to use an argument which could so easily be shown to be spurious? Was he unaware of Helen's marriage, in spite of the importance which Benoit had attached to it? Did he prefer simply to ignore this inconvenient circumstance? Or did he, perhaps, intend his audience to see it as a subtle allusion to the "rightness" of the relationship between his hero and heroine?

---

(5) Le Courant Réaliste, p.144. For similarly dismissive remarks, see P. Haidu, Aesthetic Distance and Chrétien de Troyes (Geneva 1968), p.80; G. Cohen, Chrétien de Troyes et son Oeuvre (Paris 1948), p.205.  
 (6) This is clearly stated in Benoit's source, Dares : "Priamus ... eam Alexandro coniugem dedit" (De Excidio Troiae, ed. A. Dederich (Bonn 1835) cap. XI, pp.10-11).

Thus, just as Paris and Helen were legally married in Troy, so Cligès and Fenice, who are so manifestly made for each other, would be morally "right" to live as man and wife in Britain. If it is possible to read such an interpretation into Cligès' use of the Paris-Helen story, one could say that Cligès is, by implication, taking a moral standpoint, and hinting that his relationship with Fenice is morally justified. If such is indeed Cligès' intention, his attitude once again parallels that of Fenice, whose amorality is thus interpreted by J. Frappier: "Cet idéalisme et ce paganisme mêlés situent l'amour courtois au delà du bien et du mal, dans un univers pourvu d'une autonomie morale." (7)

Turning to Amadas, we find that he, too, is apparently unconcerned by the morality of his plan to run away with someone else's wife. The main yardstick by which Amadas measures his conduct is that of Ydoine's good pleasure :

6641 Ma douce dame, or est en vous,  
 Que bien vous di, tout a estrous,  
 Que je ferai a mon pooir  
 De tout en tout vostre voloir  
 6645 Tant com avrai ou cors la vie.  
 Douce dame, or nel celés mie  
 S'en Bourgoigne volés aler,  
 Ou en cest país demourer  
 6649 Ou dépasser la mer betee  
 En aucune adverse contree,  
 En ces diverses regions  
 Qu'en ne sace qui nous soions;  
 6653 J'en ferai certes liement,  
 Dame, vostre commandement.

---

(7) Le Roman Breton : Cligès, p.57.



However, despite his submission to Ydoine's will, Amadas has a definite preference for the third of these options, and tries to persuade his lady of the advantages of flight to foreign parts. In particular, he guarantees Ydoine that she will be able to live in the manner to which she is accustomed :

6656    ... en Damediu tant me fi  
           Qu'il n'a u mont icele terre,  
           Ou soit en pais ou soit en guerre,  
           Ou je ne vous gandise bien  
 6660    A grant hounour, n'en dotés rien.

Like Cligès, Amadas is clearly concerned here with Ydoine's position in society, and seeks to reassure her that she will live "a grant hounour" as his concubine. His personal reasons for preferring flight emerge in the next few lines : they have suffered so much for their love that it is time they got away from their problems and enjoyed themselves (6663-7). Indeed, Amadas thinks it would be a good idea if they enjoyed themselves straight away (6669-75). The fact that such deport involves an act of adultery, followed by a permanently illicit relationship, does not even seem to occur to Amadas, and certainly does not trouble him. It is left to Ydoine to raise the issues of pecié, vilounie, mal and felounie, and to point out to her lover that a lifetime of avoutire is contrary to Christian law (6726-59).

However, although Amadas certainly has none of Ydoine's respect for social or Christian morality, he does seem at one point to seek to justify his plans according to a "morale de l'amour courtois". This occurs in his assertion that he and Ydoine

deserve some pleasure after all their troubles :

6663 Tant avons enduré grans maus,  
 Angouses et ires mortaus,  
 Tous nos aages sans confort,  
 S'est ore drois que li deport  
 6667 Rassouagent nostre dolour.  
 (My italics).

This reference to drois suggests that, for Amadas, faithful soldiers of Love's army can expect to enjoy the pleasures of love as their rightful reward. This does, in a sense, constitute a moral justification, sanctioned by Amor, of lovers taking whatever pleasures they may thus have earned, since this is their right (8).

However, such a glancing reference can hardly be considered a serious attempt on Amadas' part to give even a spurious morality to his proposal that he and Ydoine should live in sin, as her own emphatic rejection of his idea bears witness.

Thus, neither Cligès nor Amadas shows any regard for conventional Christian or social morality when suggesting an illicit union with the woman he loves. One may, perhaps, detect a veiled reference in both cases to a "morale de l'amour courtois" as a justification of their behaviour, but hardly any stress is

---

(8) It would appear that the author of Amadas is referring here to what F. Whitehead calls "the distinctive doctrine of courtly love : the doctrine, namely, that loyal service brings its automatic reward." (La Chastelaine de Vergi, second edition, Manchester 1961, p.xxi). Whitehead cites as evidence for this doctrine the aphorism "Amors ne tolt nului sa rente", found according to him in line 2743 of Gautier d'Arras' Ille et Galeron. I have not been able to trace this aphorism in either version of Ille, nor in Gautier's other romance, Eracle; Whitehead's reference is an enigma. Further evidence of the existence of the "automatic reward" doctrine is, however, found in the Berne Folie Tristan, lines 474-5: "L'an dit: 'Qui ainz servi Amor,/Tot lo guerredone en un jor.'" Andreas Capellanus, on the other hand, states that love is an unreliable captain who too often abandons his sailors in stormy seas (De Amore, cap.IV).

laid on this. Both heroes seem blind to every consideration except the overriding practical imperative which has always dominated the conduct of lovers : finding a way of enjoying the society of the loved one as fully, as freely and as long as possible.

Nevertheless, this readiness to dispense with marriage when marriage seems impossible does not mean that the hero rejects marriage altogether, nor that he has a positive preference for adultery or considers marriage to be incompatible with true love. In both Cligès and Amadas, the hero is only too happy to marry the heroine once the removal of her previous husband has left the way clear for him to do so. His earlier attempt at a permanent extra-marital union was simply the best solution he could find at the time, and not an attempt to evade marriage, or to set up an ideal of adulterous love in its place. Rather, the apparent amorality of these two heroes may well have the same function as another characteristic on which we have already commented : the seeming inability of heroes to show their eagerness to marry the heroine if she is an heiress. As we have seen, this characteristic serves to emphasise the disinterestedness of the hero's love, since an eagerness for marriage might be confused by the reader with an eagerness to obtain control of the heroine's wealth. In the cases of Cligès and Amadas, the hero's readiness to live with the heroine without being married to her similarly shows that it is not her money he is interested in, but herself.

Before leaving Cligès and Amadas, one further point may be of interest. We have noted that the heroes' paths diverge after they have made the suggestion of an elopement. Cligès does indeed live illicitly with Fenice, but Amadas is restrained from an illicit love by Ydoine, who introduces the moral viewpoint so notably lacking from Chrétien's romance. As J. R. Reinhard shows, the similarities between the stories of Cligès and Amadas are too many to be purely fortuitous : Cligès is a direct source for much of Amadas. Reinhard concludes that the author of Amadas "moulds that material [from Cligès] to suit his own ideas; whereas the love of Fenice is indubitably loyal, that of Ydoine is pure as well." (9). I would go further, and say that the author of Amadas does not simply "mould" the Cligès story when it conflicts with his views on chastity : he deliberately follows the plot of Cligès, and in particular the episode of the "fausse morte", in order to illustrate the difference between the conduct of his own lovers and that of Chrétien's unchaste pair. Professor Legge's view that "resemblances between this romance (i.e. Amadas) and Cligès ... are more likely accidental, and demonstrate that certain topics were in fashion at the end of the twelfth century" (10) seems to me to be based on an insufficiently close examination of the parallels between the two, and especially of the way in which the fausse morte theme is dragged into the plot of Amadas and deliberately twisted at its crucial point (the lovers' decision on their course of action after the heroine's recovery) so as to

---

(9) Amadas et Ydoine : an historical study (Durham, North Carolina, 1927), pp.28-30.

(10) Anglo-Norman Literature and its Background (Oxford, 1963), p.113.

provide a telling contrast with the behaviour of Cligès and Fenice in an exactly parallel situation. Amadas is as much an "anti-Cligès" as Cligès itself is an "anti-Tristan" (11).

Alongside Cligès and Amadas, where adultery is seen as a kind of substitute for marriage, we may set the adulterous episode in Gautier d'Arras' Eracle. Clearly, there are some notable differences : for example, Paridès, the lover of the empress Athanaïs in Eracle, is not the hero of the whole romance or even of a major part of it, but simply of this particular episode. Moreover, one can hardly maintain that he envisages adultery only as a second-best to marriage, since the empress' position precludes him from contemplating marriage to her in the first place. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that even this episode ends in the marriage of the adulterous couple. It is, moreover, made clear that Paridès is overjoyed at this happy transformation of his dangerously illicit liaison into an honourable marriage (5067-72). As Gautier d'Arras emphasises, Paridès is a fin amant (4913-8), and therefore his love is loyal and constant :

4929      Icil qui aime finement  
             N'en puet partir legierement;  
             Ne s'en part mie quant il veut  
             Cil qui de fine amor se deut.

The implication is clearly that fin'amors, even between an adulterous couple like Paridès and Athanaïs, is the kind of love

---

(11) Alison Adams also underestimates the influence of Cligès on Amadas in her article "Amadas et Ydoine and Thomas' Tristan", Forum for Modern Language Studies 14 (1978), pp.247-54, where she seeks to show that Amadas is a direct reaction to Thomas' text. She is, nevertheless, led to make comparisons with Cligès (p.253),

which forms a lasting bond, and that the ideal form which such a love can take is that of marriage.

Paridès may also be compared to Cligès and Amadas in that he feels no moral scruples about embarking on an affair with a married woman. In part, this lack of a moral dimension to Paridès' character is no doubt due to Gautier's lack of interest in him as a protagonist: he remains a conventional figure, the stock "young lover" with the expected sentimental and heroic responses, while Gautier's main interest centres on the situation and reactions of his heroine, Athanais. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that Paridès does not in any way share the profound sense of guilt so movingly expressed by his beloved (4605-19). Instead, his response to her lament is purely one of devotion and gratitude to this empress who has deigned to love him (4631-9). Moreover, when confronted by her husband, he proudly defies the threats of the outraged emperor in terms which suggest that he too, like Cligès and Amadas, feels justified by Love :

4913 Sire, trop desfaites mon conte:  
 Ne quit pas que cil muire a honte  
 Qui muert por fine amor veraie.  
 Mius aim tel mort que vil mort aie,  
 4917 Mius aim morir sifaitement  
 Que longues vivre por noient.

Thus, once again, we find a hero suggesting that his adultery is in some way vindicated by a "morale de l'amour courtois".

Having noted that the author of Amadas deliberately opposes the "lax" morality of Cligès, it is tempting to try to discover the

moral standpoint of Gautier d'Arras. As in Amadas, the hero's amorality is counter-balanced in Eracle by the heroine, who expresses the view that their adultery is a sin which God will punish. On the other hand, like Cligès and Fenice, the couple do in fact commit adultery. Moreover, their action is morally sanctioned in a way which is far more explicit than Chrétien's implied approval of his characters' behaviour. In Gautier's work, the voice of morality, and indeed of directly revealed divine judgment, is that of Eracle himself. On the Paridès episode, Eracle's judgment is unequivocal : the errant couple should be forgiven, since the real blame for their misconduct lies with the emperor (4961-5044).

Thus in both Cligès and Eracle, not only is adultery in fact committed, but also the hero's amoral attitude appears to be condoned by the author. The author of Amadas, on the other hand, gives a distinctly more moral emphasis to his tale.

Nevertheless, as we have seen, Cligès, Amadas and Paridès all aspire to permanent union with the women they love, and find their ultimate fulfilment in matrimony. Their choice of an illicit liaison does not mean that they prefer adultery, but simply that marriage is not a possible option for them at the time. None of these works glorifies adulterous love in the manner of Chrétien's Charrete ; rather, they show adultery to be a poor substitute for the ideal form of love-relationship, that of marriage. Cligès and Amadas, indeed, envisage a permanent

extra-marital relationship as an approximation to marriage, but this is far from being an idealisation of adultery. Instead, it is an attempt to make adultery conform as closely as possible to the ideal condition of marriage, with its permanent, exclusive possession of the loved one.

We must now consider a different sort of adulterous affair: one in which the hero would not have preferred to marry the woman concerned had she been available, and which ends in separation, not in marriage. This sort of temporary illicit affair is even less common in the romances chosen for this study than the kind of permanent extra-marital union which we have been considering. Indeed, the only hero who engages in a temporary adulterous love in these romances is Durmart, the protagonist of Durmart li Galois.

At the age of fifteen, prince Durmart falls in love with a married woman of lower rank than himself. The affair lasts for about three and a half years, and there is no doubt about the strength of Durmart's love; we are told that he loves the lady de fin cuer (1.379), and he promises her that "tos jors serons nos mais ensemble" (1.533) (12). However, there is no question of

---

(12) All the lovers in Durmart, including not only the hero and heroine but also the seneschal's wife (309) and Brun de Morois, the ravisher of Guenevere (4546-7), experience fine amor. The expression is not simply a cliché, however, for the author distinguishes li fin amant from the desireor who are fickle and unstable in love (5155-5170). There appears to be some inconsistency in describing Durmart's transitory passion for the seneschal's wife as fine amor, but possibly the author considered that Durmart's sincere belief that he would indeed love the lady for ever qualified him to be classed as a fin amant in this case.



marriage, nor even, as with Cligès and Amadas, of running away together so that they can live unmolested in a foreign country. The sens of the episode is, indeed, quite different from that of the examples of extra-marital love we have examined so far. Unlike the fin'amor of Cligès, Amadas and Paridès, Durmart's fine feelings are degrading, and prove to be transitory. One spring morning, he decides to end the relationship, and leaves his mistress with scarcely a backward glance (lines 655-96). He has realised that his love for her was unworthy and shameful, and is now determined to pursue his true vocation as a knight and a king's son:

599 Je sui filz a si tresprodome,  
Et l'on ne poroit dusqu'a Rome  
Trover si malvais com je sui ...  
608 ... je deüsse hautement  
Chevalerie maintenir  
Et tot le païs resbaudir.  
Trop ai ceste amor maintenue,  
612 Je doi mais bien issir de mue.  
Miech ain de la dame a partir  
Que moi abaissier ne honir,  
Quar on doit bien l'amor laissier  
616 Dont on ne fait fors empirier.

Thus Durmart's adulterous love is condemned as a bad influence. He has, in fact, abandoned both his career as a knight and his place in court life in order to enjoy the company of the seneschal's wife:

377 ... a Durmart riens ne plaisoit  
For s la dame que il amoit.

As a result of this obsessive passion, Durmart loses all interest in tournaments and is branded as a coward (malvais) (lines 405-8).

Nor is his own reputation the only thing that suffers. As the heir to the throne, he should uphold chivalry and keep up the morale of the country ("Chevalerie maintenir/Et tot le païs resbaudir"). Instead, he hates the company of knights (409-410), and causes general gloom and despondency amongst the people, who dread the day of his accession to the throne (562-5).

These harmful results of Durmart's love for a woman who is not only another man's wife, but also is of lower rank than himself, are contrasted with the benefits of his later love for the virgin Queen of Ireland. This royal damsel perfectly fits the criteria laid down by Durmart's father for a suitable bride for a prince :

- 860 N'est pas amors de fil a roi  
Vers la feme d'un vavassor. (13)  
Filz de roi doit avoir amor  
A haute pucelle roial  
864 Ou a roïne emperial.  
Mais vavassor et bachelor  
Cil doivent haut et bas amer;  
De fil a roi n'est pas ensi.  
868 Quant je fui jones j'e[n]tendi  
A fille a roi de haut parage  
Tant que je l'oi par mariage.

And Durmart does indeed, as we saw in the previous chapter, set out with the idea of winning his "princesse lointaine" as his bride.

---

(13) The king's seneschal in Durmart is, apparently, a vavassor. Being rich, powerful, noble, and elderly (149-174, 383-7), he is neither a typical vavassor nor a typical seneschal as these figures are described by B. Wolledge in his article "Bons Vavasseurs et Mauvais Sénéchaux", Mélanges ... Rita Lejeune (Gembloux, 1969), vol. II, pp.1263-1277.

Nor are rank and marriageability the only assets of the Queen of Ireland. Durmart's quest for her will provide him with a chance to win a reputation for valour (1183-8, 1318-30), which will redeem him from the slur of being called malvais. Whereas the seneschal's wife was "la dame ... por qui je perdoie mon pris" (855-6), winning the love of the Irish Queen will increase his pris (1155-6) (14). The effect of his adulterous love, as Durmart says in lines 599-616, quoted above, was to "moi abaissier [et] honir", but his new love will bring him honour :

1341    Querre voiz la bele roïne,  
           Que li cuers me dist et devine  
           Ke par li serai honorés.

The anti-social consequences of Durmart's adulterous affair are also contrasted with his new love, which brings him into harmony with society and has beneficial results for the kingdom. Admittedly, Durmart's quest involves a physical separation from society, but this is very different from the moral and spiritual alienation of the years when he was faillis (line 558). Now, Durmart sets out with the blessing of his parents and of the people (1373-6, 1427-67) (15). His quest brings social benefits

---

(14) Pris in Durmart includes both renown for knightly prowess and valour, as in lines 634-8 ("Feraï je tant par ma proëce/Que mes peres ... / ... de mon pris se fera lié."), and esteem or renown in a more general sense, as in lines 15929-15950 ("Li bons rois Artus est fenis, Mais encore dure ses pris", etc). A detailed semantic study of the terms pris, valor, honor and bien in Durmart would, I believe, show that the author uses these terms in very closely related senses.

(15) A charming detail, indicative of the unity of spirit between Durmart and the Welsh court during his knight-errantry, is the hero's habit of sending defeated knights home to his mother with reassuring messages about her son's health and safety - the medieval equivalent, perhaps, of a serviceman's "I'm all right, Mum" in letters home (lines 3611-20, 4833-44, 5921-34).

for it leads to a marital alliance with the realm of Fenise, the Irish Queen, which increases the power and prestige of Durmart's own kingdom. Moreover, instead of neglecting and avoiding his fellow-knights, Durmart now asks his father particularly to look after his companions-in-arms until he returns (1359-66), and during his travels he associates readily with fine knights such as those of the Chastel as Dis Puceles, and enters into contact with the finest of all, the knights of the Round Table. Thus Durmart's adultery with a socially inferior woman is explicitly contrasted with his love for the noble, virtuous and marriageable Fenise, leaving us in no doubt about the sens of the episode (16).

Nevertheless, although the author of Durmart clearly intends us to see his protagonist's adulterous love in an unfavourable light, it is noteworthy that there is hardly any condemnation of the affair on specifically Christian grounds. As we have seen, Durmart's liaison is reprehensible because it does not inspire him to valour and therefore destroys his personal reputation, and also because it is demoralising for the society of which he is the future head. The criticisms of Durmart's father, expressed in lines 860-870 (quoted above), bear far more on the low status of Durmart's paramour than on the immorality of the liaison. Nor is there any moral censure of the woman herself; diatribes against her as an incarnation of lust, a new Eve seducing the hero away from the path of righteousness, which one sometimes finds in such

---

(16) These deliberate contrasts must have been overlooked by Marie-José Southworth, who states that "l'épisode de Durmart avec la femme du sénéchal ... est un hors-d'oeuvre plutôt qu'une vraie introduction" to the romance (Etude Comparée de Quatre Romans Médiévaux, Paris 1973, p.106).

a context, are totally absent (17). Only at one point is there an explicit reference to the immorality of Durmart's conduct. His father, justifiably furious, lectures the errant prince :

457 Tu aimes luxure et perece;  
 Dehés ait bealtés sens proëce.  
 Tres beaz malvais, enten a moi:  
 Sez que doit faire filz de roi?  
 461 Il doit amer les chevaliers  
 Et honorer et tenir chiers ...  
 465 Si doit le siecle resbadir,  
 Joie et proëce maintenir.  
 Filz de roi doit estre loialz  
 Dignes et vrais et de cuer halz;  
 469 Ne doit estre luxurios,  
 Quar c'est uns plais vilz et hontoz.  
 Tu fais pechié mout desloial  
 De la femme le seneschal  
 473 Que tu tiens.

Even here, it will be noticed, Durmart's social failings (his neglect of his knights and failure to resbadir le siecle), and personal shortcomings such as lack of proëce, occupy a more important place than the sin of luxure. The pechié of keeping the seneschal's wife as his mistress is, it seems, reprehensible because it is an act of disloyalty towards a vassal, and as such is unworthy of a king's son; the moral condemnation of lines 469-73 is associated with a criticism based on purely feudal values. Christian morality was not, apparently, an important consideration to the author of Durmart. Indeed, his romance is noticeably one in which worldly and social values predominate; critics have commented particularly on his predilection for courtly festivities, fine

---

(17) The seneschal's wife is, in fact, sympathetically portrayed throughout, as a pretty eighteen-year-old married to a much older man and glad of the chance to have a little fun and romance. The author makes a point of telling us that, after the affair had ended, she was fully reconciled to her husband, and that he, noble man, did not bear a grudge or make her suffer for her infidelity (903-919).

banquets, and elegant manners, all of which he describes with an evident enjoyment (18). The Christian element in the romance, on the other hand, has been judged by G. Paris to be very superficial : "l'élément chrétien est demeuré tout extérieur et pourrait être supprimé sans que le poème en souffrît le moins du monde." (19). It is, therefore, in keeping with the generally mondain values of this romance that adultery should be condemned rather on chivalric and social grounds than on the grounds of sin and immorality.

Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that adultery is indeed condemned, and condemned precisely for its failure to inspire those courtly and chivalrous virtues with which adulterous "courtly love" is often associated (20). As we noted in the previous chapter, the author of Durmart fervently advocates the marriage of lovers, and explicitly opposes those who assert that lovers should not marry each other. His introduction of the adulterous episode in his hero's career is clearly intended as a counter-example, through which the benefits of marriage-directed love can be sharply contrasted with the harmful effects of adultery.

(18) See, for example, G. Paris, "Romans en vers du cycle de la Table Ronde", HLF XXX (1888), pp.154 ff; J. D. Bruce, Evolution of Arthurian Romance (Göttingen 1928), vol.II, p.228; J. Gildea, Durmart le Galois (Villanova, 1965-6), vol.II, pp.103-5.

(19) Art. cit., p.145. This remark is made in connexion with Durmart's vision of the Christ-child in a candle-decked tree, which introduces the only overtly Christian theme in the romance.

(20) The power of adulterous courtly love to inspire prowess and social refinement has been commented on by critics from Gaston Paris till the present, as indicated in part I of the present thesis. Although some scholars have over-emphasised the adulterous element in fine amor, the concept of an ennobling adulterous love was well-established, though not necessarily accepted, in courtly circles, as J. Frappier emphasises in his article "Sur un Procès fait à l'Amour Courtois", Amour Courtois et Table Ronde (Geneva 1973), pp.61-96.

Two other adulterous episodes must be considered in order to complete our survey of the heroes in the romances used for this study who have extra-marital liaisons. Both episodes are similar in tone, and both reveal a somewhat curious attitude to adultery.

Our first case-history is that of Prophilias, one of the two heroes of Alexandre de Bernai's Athis et Prophilias. As the title indicates, this work centres on male friendship rather than on heterosexual love, and it is from this point of view that adultery is seen. Prophilias' liaison with the wife of his friend, Athis, is related as a remarkable instance of the self-sacrificing friendship between the two young men. Learning that his friend Prophilias is literally dying for love of Cardionès, the girl to whom he himself is betrothed, Athis nobly resolves to give up his place in the conjugal bed to his companion in order to save the latter's life (lines 905-934). In order to impress us still further with the heroism of Athis' renunciation, Alexandre de Bernai dwells at length on the mental struggle of the young husband, lying beside his beautiful bride and strongly attracted to her, yet renouncing his right to possess her physically (967-1002, 1024-1148) (21). The

---

(21) The scene belongs to a tradition studied by P. Jonin in Les Personnages Féminins dans les Romans français de Tristan au XIIIe siècle (Aix-en-Provence, 1958), pp.399-414. As Jonin points out, a distinction can be drawn between the epic theme of the hero's stern indifference to enticing womanhood, and the theme of the intense mental battle waged by the hero against the temptation of the flesh. This second theme can be traced back to the Desert Fathers. The Athis et Prophilias version belongs to the second group, but recalls the epic tradition in that the motive for the hero's chastity is chivalric and not religious.

masculine code of companionship triumphs in the end, of course, and the principle on which Athis sacrifices his wife can be gauged from the following lines:

989     Asez a il de beles fames  
          Par lo pãis et par les regnes.  
          Se je por une leis morir  
          Mon compaignon que puis garir,  
 993     Ja mes en moi n'ait hom fiance  
          Ne conpaingnie n'esperance.

After some years of this ménage à trois, Prophilius is recalled to Rome, and Athis perfects his sacrifice by publicly renouncing Cardionès and giving her to his friend in marriage, so that the love-sick Prophilius can take her with him on his journey (1366-1650). Prophilius comments that this is a great sign of Athis' love for him:

1513   Car onques mes nus hom, ce croi  
          En autre ne trova tel foi.

Thus the main point of the adulterous episode in Athis et Prophilius is to demonstrate Athis' devotion to his friend (22).

One imagines that Alexandre faced a problem in his depiction of Prophilius, the adulterous lover who accepts his friend's sacrifice. It must have been difficult to make Prophilius appear an attractive and noble figure, yet as joint hero he could hardly be allowed to seem base and selfish. Alexandre seeks to solve his problem by stressing the irresistible force of the love to which

---

(22) The source of this episode is an Oriental tale in which a merchant shows his friendship for another in the same way. Alexandre probably found the story in the Disciplina Clericalis of Pierre Alphonse, according to Lage F. W. Staël von Holstein, Le Roman d'Athis et Prophilius (Uppsala 1909), pp.46-7.



Prophilias falls victim. Prophiliias, in a mental debate over whether he should indeed sleep with his friend's wife, realises that such an act is "felenie ... orguil et traison" (1169-70), but Amor is too powerful, and overcomes his better judgment. His dilemma is presented as a contest between Amor and Savoir, in which Amor, with its ability to inflict physical illness and even death, is victorious: Alexandre allows us to feel that this is an unfair victory of Might over Right (548-762; 1157-1218). The sheer physical force of love is conveyed in lines such as "Amors le prant, el lit le bote" (1207), as well as in the graphic descriptions of Prophiliias lying at the point of death. Finally, Alexandre suggests that Prophiliias' decision to sleep with Cardionès is justifiable because a man has the right, and even the duty, to save his own life if he can:

1237	Seignor, ne vos an mervelliez, Se cil qui est a mort plaiez, Quiert mecine por lui garir: Huem ne se doit leissier morir,
1241	Tant com il paise vivre plus ...
1245	Vilenie fist il mout grant; Mes il santoit lo feu ardant Qui li avoit le cors espris, Don ne cuidoit eschaper vis.
1249	Se il an quist mecinemant, Qui li torna a sauvemant, Ne li tort nus cest fet a tort; Car il dotoit formant la mort.

Thus Alexandre has to admit that his protagonist's action is "vilenie", but seeks to justify it on the grounds that Prophiliias has either to commit such "vilenie" or to allow himself to be

killed by that unconquerable power, Amor (23).

In keeping with Alexandre's primary interest in depicting friendship, we find that the "vilenie" Prophilias chiefly dreads is not the sin of adultery, but treachery towards his friend. The idea of the "felenie" of betraying Athis horrifies him, and he struggles violently against his love for Cardionès in order to be true to his companion (579-614, 723-762). He can hardly bring himself to tell Athis what the cause of his mortal sickness is, because "la physique an est vileinne/ Ancontre toi" (898-9). On the point of getting into bed with Cardionès, it is again the thought of the treachery he is perpetrating towards Athis which makes him hesitate (1157-74). As in Durmart, the hero's guilt springs from the social consequences of his act, rather than from a religious condemnation of his immorality.

One other aspect of Prophilias' adultery deserves comment, and this is the exclusively physical nature of his relations with Cardionès. Unlike the other heroes we have examined here, Prophilias' love is completely one-sided, and is not in any way reciprocated by the woman concerned, Cardionès, indeed, is kept in complete ignorance of the fact that the man who joins her in bed at night is not the man she married, and believes that she is a chaste wife having normal sexual relations with her husband. Prophilias, to her,

---

(23) To allow himself to die would, in effect, be suicide, a crime regarded with particular abhorrence by the Church because it is a rejection of God's gift of life. This seems to be the bearing of line 1240, "Huem ne se doit leissier morir". Thomas Aquinas' statement of the case against suicide is given in the Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, ed. A. Vacant, vol. 14 ii, col. 2742.

is simply her husband's friend. Since he does not once speak to her during their nights together, and keeps up the pretence of indifference during the day, Prophilius' relations with Cardionès consist only of the physical act of sex; there is no emotional bond between them. Moreover, Prophilius seems perfectly satisfied with this purely carnal relationship. His love-malady is entirely cured as a result, and though he still sighs over Cardionès, physical possession of her is sufficient in itself to make him as fit and handsome as ever (1279-84).

Nevertheless, like all the heroes discussed so far, except Durmart, Prophilius eventually marries his partner in adultery, and the couple lead a married life of mutual love and perfect harmony, symbolised in this case by their matching clothes:

1819	En joie sont et nuit et jor, Mout s'antr'aient de bone amor; Tant s'antr'aimment communalment Qu'andui se vestent d'un samblant,
1823	D'une color et tot d'uns dras.

We are not told how Cardionès, at first tearful and protesting at being swapped from one husband to another (1599-1650), comes to love her new lord, but clearly Alexandre thought that an already established sexual rapport was a good foundation for the growth of love in the young woman's heart. This can be seen in the passage where Athis delicately sounds out his wife's feelings towards the man she has been sleeping with, and concludes bitterly that this is the man Cardionès loves (1525-47).

Thus the hero's adultery in Athis et Prophilias is significant mainly for what it tells us about the bond between the two men concerned, the husband and the lover. Athis' renunciation of his conjugal rights is a sublime example of friendship between man and man; the moral problem faced by Prophilias is seen in terms of treachery towards his friend, not of unchastity or of a sin against marriage; and the psychological interest of the situation is centred on the relationship between Prophilias and Athis, and quite absent from Prophilias' relations with Cardionès.

Our last example of a hero who contemplates adultery is Claris, one of the protagonists of the comparatively late romance Claris et Laris (24). His story may be compared with that of Prophilias, since in both cases the idea of adultery is used to demonstrate the loyalty between two friends. However, the author of Claris et Laris seems to have given little thought to the moral and psychological problems involved, and successively presents both adultery and conjugal fidelity as acts of disloyalty to the chivalric code. Like Alexandre de Bernai, he is more interested in male companionship than in heterosexual love, and judges his hero's behaviour largely in terms of its effect on other men. Thus, when Claris first falls in love with the wife of his elderly lord, he decides to leave court in order to avoid any disloyalty to his lord, Ladont (lines 307-353). Later, Claris

---

(24) According to the editor, J. Alton, Claris et Laris was begun in 1268 (Bibliothek des Litterarischen Vereins in Stuttgart vol. 169, p.863). The work is a very second-rate one, and is rightly categorized by J. D. Bruce as "this tedious romance" and "this mediocre and interminable poem" (The Evolution of Arthurian Romance, vol.II, p.265 and p.275).

fears that his love will affect his friendship with Laris, for Laris is the brother of Lidaine, the woman concerned (3836 ff.). At this point, adultery, which Claris had earlier considered to be an unthinkable act of treachery towards his lord, becomes a commendable sign of the friendship between the two companions, for Laris shows his devotion to Claris by promising to procure his sister for him (3970-9). Aided and abetted by the remarkably amoral Laris, Claris does indeed win from Lidaine a promise that she will kiss and embrace him, but no more (lines 7885 ff.); eventually, after Ladont's death, Laris gives his sister to Claris in marriage (14445 ff.). The author treats the whole chain of events in a curiously superficial way, without developing the psychology of the characters involved or probing into the moral issue. He is mainly concerned to demonstrate Claris' loyalty to his lord, and the loyalty of both heroes to each other. Where the two loyalties conflict, it is the bond of companionship which wins; when Claris abandons his earlier decision not to reveal his love to his lord's wife, it is because the author now wants to give Laris the opportunity to show his friendship by attempting to debauch his own sister in Claris' favour. Laris experiences none of the agonising hesitation which Alexandre de Bernai so convincingly depicts in the case of Athis; it does not seem to have occurred to the author of Claris et Laris that the young man might realistically wish to uphold his sister's honour, nor that an interesting psychological debate could arise out of the conflict between Laris' loyalty to his sister and to his friend. The dramatic intensity achieved by Alexandre de Bernai is totally

lacking from the thirteenth-century author's work. This loss of intensity is partly due to the dilution of the love theme by innumerable chivalric exploits, and partly to the alteration in the relationship between the principal characters : it is no longer a wife, but a sister, who must be sacrificed in order to prove the devotion of one friend to another. This, combined with the fact that no act of adultery takes place, may suggest that the moral tone adopted by thirteenth-century writers was stricter than that of their twelfth-century predecessors, as J. C. Payen maintains (25).

These are the only heroes in the romances under study here who engage in or contemplate adulterous love. In the cases of Cligès and Amadas, the hero's adultery may be seen as laudable, for it demonstrates the disinterestedness of his feelings. Even though he cannot marry her, and thus obtain control of her lands and wealth, the hero still loves his lady enough to want to run away with her and live clandestinely as man and wife; or, in the case of Paridès, he loves her enough to risk death for the sake of spending a few hours in her arms. The only heroes who have scruples about loving another man's wife are Prophilius and Claris, who object to the idea on the grounds that it involves treachery to a friend or to a lord. The only ones who are explicitly condemned by the author for their adulterous love are Prophilius and Durmart. In all these cases, adultery is criticised because it is anti-social, rather than because it is immoral. In general, we may say that authors do not take a strong moral stand when looking at adultery

---

(25) "La Destruction des Mythes Courtois", Revue des Langues Romanes 78 (1969), p.221.

from the hero's point of view. Condemnation of adultery from the standpoint of Christian morality is either expressed by a character other than the hero — for example, the heroines in Amadas and Eracle — or else is absent altogether, as in Cligès.

In no case, however, is adultery presented as the ideal form of love-relationship. Only Durmart has a temporary love-affair; the others all aspire to the permanence of matrimony, and Cligès and Amadas seek to reproduce this permanence in their visions of a clandestine union. For them, adultery is a second-best to marriage, and is forced on them by circumstances. In Durmart's case, adultery is deliberately contrasted with marriage-directed love, and the author shows Durmart's illicit love as a lustful, ignoble passion, which unmans the hero and disturbs society. Each of the six finds his eventual happiness in marriage, and not in adultery, and Chrétien's well-known passage in praise of Cligès' love-marriage could apply to all of them :

6633      De s'amie a faite sa dame, (26)  
             Car il l'a pele amie et dame,  
             Et por ce ne pert ele mie  
             Que il ne l'aint come s'amie,  
 6637      Et ele lui tot autresi  
             Con l'en doit amer son ami,  
             Et chascun jor lor amors crut.

This idyllic picture, however, might have raised a question in the minds of a medieval French audience : what is the legal validity of these marriages between adulterous couples? We should note that, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, such unions would have raised two problems : the grounds for the dissolution of the woman's

---

(26) The quotation is from Guiot's manuscript. All other manuscripts read "fame" for "dame", according to the variants given by W. Foerster in his first edition of Cligès (Halle, 1884).

previous marriage, and the legality of any subsequent marriage between the adulterers.

The first of these problems is presented by Eracle, Athis et Prophilius, and Amadas, in all of which there appears to be a divorce between the heroine and her first husband (27). In Eracle, the divorce appears to have some characteristics in common with the repudiation of an adulterous wife as envisaged in Matthew 19, 8-9. Eracle advises the emperor Laïs to repudiate Athanaïs legally, through the agency of the Pope, by pronouncing the words "Je vos guerpis":

5009        Se vos en partés bielement  
              Par l'apostole loiaument, (28)  
              Dites li tant : "Je vos guerpis".

Laïs agrees that such a course is legitimate:

5046        Je pris cesti par main de prestre  
              Si m'en voel loiaument partir.

---

(27) The problem of the dissolution of the first marriage is avoided in Cligès and Claris et Laris, where the husband conveniently dies.  
 (28) The apostole in this context is clearly the Pope, and not the apostle Paul, as G. Raynaud de Lage imagines (Eracle, ed. G. Raynaud de Lage, CFMA vol. 102, pp.212-3). The usage of apostole to designate the spiritual heirs of the apostle Peter is generally adopted by Gautier; see Ille et Galeron (SATF edition) lines 2657-3469, passim. Moreover, as the entries in TL clearly show, the word apostoile always refers to the Pope, while the sense of "apostle" is represented by apostle, apostre. Hence, Raynaud de Lage's argument that "la mention de l'apostole ne peut renvoyer qu'à saint Paul, et donc au 'privilège paulin'", and that Gautier "commet une grosse erreur en évoquant le privilège paulin" (loc.cit.) is quite irrelevant.



Such a divorce, though earlier sanctioned by the Church, was no longer tolerated by the canon law of Gautier's own day, as we have pointed out above in Part II, pp. 54 - 59. However, the Merovingian and Carolingian periods had allowed such a practice, and A. Fourrier considers that this tolerance of divorce in cases of adultery still existed in the twelfth century, though in a disguised form:

Certes, au XIIe siècle, l'adultère ne fait plus en théorie exception au principe que seule la mort rompt le mariage, mais dans la pratique on couvrait de subterfuges canoniques, dont le plus fréquent était un degré prohibé de parenté, le motif réel, comme cela se vit par exemple lors du célèbre divorce de Louis VII et d'Eléonore. (29)

Thus, in presenting the separation of Athanaïs and Laïs as a legally-sanctioned divorce for adultery, Gautier is reflecting the practice, if not the theory, of his own day, thinks Fourrier: "Gautier d'Arras demeure fidèle à l'esprit et à la 'morale' de son temps." (loc.cit.). G. Raynaud de Lage, however, points out that divorce and remarriage in cases of adultery were officially practised by the Greek Church; he believes that Gautier knew of this fact, and was accurately reproducing the canon law of the Eastern Church in his adaptation of this Byzantine story (30). This seems to me a far more satisfactory explanation of the clear legal process depicted by Gautier than does Fourrier's theory. Gautier did not want to show his hero and heroine benefiting from a "subterfuge canonique"; rather, he wanted to stress that their marriage was fully legal, as his repeated use of the adverb loiaument demonstrates.

---

(29) Le Courant Réaliste (Paris 1960), p.268.

(30) Gautier d'Arras, Eracle, ed. G. Raynaud de Lage (Paris 1976), p.213.

The divorce in Athis is rather more complex. Unlike Gautier d'Arras, Alexandre de Bernai apparently does project twelfth-century marriage law onto his Graeco-Roman story. The case is, in effect, a form of the sponsa duorum problem, the test-case in the consensus/copula debate, and is resolved in favour of the latter (31). Alexandre clearly thinks that the marriage is made by physical consummation; Athis does not consummate his marriage, but lets Prophilius take his place, so Prophilius is legally the husband of Cardionès. The importance of physical relations is underlined by the fact that, in order to be able to marry Cardionès to Prophilius, Athis has to refrain from ever consummating the marriage himself. Clearly, once he had done so, his union with Cardionès would be a matrimonium ratum and could not be dissolved in Prophilius' favour.

Thus we find that Athis, having allowed Prophilius to deflower his bride on the wedding night, returns to the conjugal bed but refrains from establishing conjugal relations:

1264        Lors se porpense de grant foi  
              Que il ja en li part n'aura,  
              Mes son conpeignon la donra.

---

(31) See above, pp. 61-74, for an outline of the history of this legal debate in the twelfth century. Evidently, the situation in Athis et Prophilius differs in one vital respect from the classic case of the sponsa duorum: Cardionès is not the sponsa of Prophilius, having given no form of consent whatsoever to any union with him. However, this absence of a desponsatio need not prevent us from interpreting Alexandre de Bernai's story in the light of the sponsa duorum legislation, since a willingness to overlook the need for consent, and particularly the consent of the woman, was only too marked a characteristic of matrimony as practised at the period.

Later, he explains to Prophilius that he performed this act of renunciation in order to be able to give his wife legally to his friend:

1489      ... onques en li n'oi charnel part;  
               Donc la doies avoir plus tart.  
               Tant a de l'auté en moi  
               Que je m'an sui temuz por toi.  
 1493      Or la te doing de bon talant;  
               Va, si l'espouse l'œumant!

This emphasis on the legality of the second marriage is made even more apparent when Athis explains the situation to Cardionès. He tells her that the law grants her union to Prophilius: "la lois lo done" (1602), and moreover that Prophilius, and he alone, is her lawful husband:

1603      Il ert tes sire par reison  
               Ne nen as droit se an lui non.

Athis' marriage, then, is legally invalidated by its non-consumation, while the establishment of sexual relations between Cardionès and Prophilius creates a bond between them which can and must be regularised by marrying them legally to each other. The families of both Cardionès and Athis accept that Cardionès' marriage to Prophilius is inevitable in the circumstances (1693-6), and both the dissolution and the new marriage are carried out, with a curious combination of Christianity and paganism, as religious ceremonies in a temple of Venus (1701-6).

This legal process is quite different from the divorce for adultery envisaged by Gautier d'Arras in Eracle. Cardionès does, indeed, imagine at one point that Athis is seeking just such a

divorce on the grounds of her adultery, and hotly protests her innocence (1609-1614), but Athis makes it clear that what he envisages is the dissolution of an unconsummated marriage in favour of a second, consummated union (1615-28, and the passages quoted above). This, as we noted in Part II, pp. 61-5, was the solution to the sponsa duorum problem favoured by eminent churchmen from Hincmar of Reims in the ninth century till Gratian in the 1140s. Moreover, such an emphasis on physical consummation is, as Esmein noted, typical of the "coutumes et conceptions populaires" which so strongly influenced the formation of canon law on this point (32). However, at the time when Athis et Prophilias was written, the consensualist view had come to predominate, and Pope Alexander III maintained the indissolubility of unconsummated marriages even where a subsequent, consummated union had taken place (33). Thus Alexandre de Bernai does not reflect the legislation of his own day, but that of previous generations. His conviction that the copula is essential to form a valid marriage also echoes the popular ideas of the laity, and indicates how slowly the theories of canonists penetrated the general public.

---

(32) Le Mariage en Droit Canonique, first edition (Paris 1891), vol. I, pp. 83-4.

(33) Athis et Prophilias was probably written before Chrétien de Troyes' Cligès, according to W. Foerster, "Randglossen zum Athisroman", Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 36 (1912), pp. 727-36.

Athis and Prophilius, though pagans, were made to conform by Alexandre with what he assumed were the matrimonial laws of his own day. In doing this, Alexandre in fact shows the same concern as Gautier d'Arras with depicting a fully legal process. He is evidently anxious that his audience should know that Prophilius' marriage is completely valid. Divorce and remarriage were no longer accepted in the twelfth century, and Alexandre therefore takes pains to establish that the procedure here is not one of divorce, but of the dissolution of a non-consummated marriage. Following such a dissolution, the marriage of Prophilius and Cardionès is not a remarriage, but a legal resolution of Cardionès' position as a sponsa duorum. In terms of much of the Church legislation of the period preceding Alexandre's own day, the process is entirely valid, and none could question the lawfulness of Prophilius' marriage.

In Amadas et Ydoine, where the protagonists are French and Christian, we may assume that the author needed to be even more careful over the legality of the pair's eventual marriage. The process envisaged by the author of this work is, indeed, fully in accordance with the legal provisions of his day. As in Athis, any suggestion of a divorce is carefully avoided. The heroine's first marriage is annulled, and the grounds are those which, as Fourrier pointed out, were most frequently used in such cases : a forbidden degree of consanguinity:

7342      Au jor qu'il assisent mult pres  
              Eveskes font venir assés  
              Et autres gens, clers et letrés,  
              Qui les ont par crestienté  
 7346      Partis tout a leur volenté,  
              Soit par parage u par el.

The fact that the grounds for the annulment are a legal fiction is neatly brought out by the off-hand way in which the author mentions the parage. However, this does not in any way make the annulment illicit; it simply demonstrates the author's familiarity with the legal process concerned in such cases, which often involved "subterfuges canoniques" of this kind (34). The important point is that the annulment is pronounced by bishops, in accordance with the Christian faith (par crestienté).

Thus, in the three works where the hero marries a woman after her separation from her previous husband, we find that the author is careful to depict this separation as an irreproachably legal act, which does not infringe the canonical principle of the indissolubility of marriage.

---

(34) A. Fourrier. Le Courant Réaliste, p.268, quoted above. The author has, in fact, given Ydoine unimpeachable legal grounds for her annulment through the lack of her consent to the marriage, but does not choose to have the annulment pronounced for this reason. Possibly this reflects the fact that, like mental cruelty in modern divorce law, the impediment of vis et metus was difficult to prove, whereas consanguinity was relatively easy to establish, at least for noble families. An annulment for parage would therefore be more realistic than one for a forced marriage. Ydoine's annulment is discussed more fully below, *Part IV, Chap. 2*.

However, the legal validity of these separations was not the only problem which a twelfth- or thirteenth-century audience might have associated with a marriage <sup>be</sup> tween a couple who had committed adultery. Even where the first husband had died, as in the case of Cligès, there was a strong prejudice against any subsequent marriage between adulterers. This prejudice had, in earlier centuries, had the force of law, and the declaration of Pope Leo I that "nullus ducat in matrimonium, quam prius polluit adulterio" was widely known, and was enshrined in Gratian's Decretum (35). In fact, in the second half of the twelfth century, simple adultery was no longer a legal impediment to marriage, but the prejudice against such unions remained. The commentator of the Livre de Jostice et de Plet seems to think that a decision of Alexander III's in favour of such marriages must be an exception: "Et note deus cas où l'en puet prendre cele o qui l'en a fet avotire, si comme la letre de la décrétale le chante". He is later able to comment, with ringing certainty, that "marriage ne pot estre entre avotires, ne il ne se poent alors marier ... Note que nul ne pot avoir à feme cele que il a cochié en avotire" (36). In the light of this belief that marriages between adulterers ought not to be allowed, it is intriguing to note that the only heroes who do indeed marry women with whom they have committed adultery are either pagans, like Prophilias, or belong to the Eastern Church, where there was greater tolerance of such

---

(35) See the section on Crimen in Part II above for more details.

(36) Jostice et Plet, ed. P. N. Rapetti (Paris 1850), p.195 and p.196. This work is dated "vers 1260" by G. Paris, La Littérature Française au Moyen Age, fifth edition (Paris 1913), p.278.

marriages (Cligès and Paridès). Claris and Amadas, on the other hand, do not engage in any act of physical adultery, and the heroine of Amadas warns her lover explicitly that to do so would rule out any possibility of a Christian wedding:

6751 Et s'ore le me fasiés,  
 Bien savés que fait ariés  
 Si grant pechiet et si cruel  
 Et si orible et si mortel  
 6755 Que puis ne porriés ja mais,  
 Selonc crestienté, après  
 Nule baillie avoir de moi  
 D'espouser fors encontre loy  
 6759 Et en avoutire jesir. (37)

We thus find that, although the hero's adultery is seldom censured from the point of view of Christian morality, and indeed is often justified by a "morale de l'amour courtois", the marriage of the hero to his partner in adultery is made to conform fairly strictly to canon law, in so far as the authors of our romances understood it. Gautier d'Arras appears the most learned, and accurately describes a divorce for adultery as prescribed in the Eastern Church. Alexandre de Bernai and the author of Amadas both reflect an earlier state of Western canon law than that which actually prevailed in their own day, and this may demonstrate the conservatism of the general public. It may well have been the case that, for some time after the learned doctors of the Church had modified their ideas, many people still thought that consummation was essential to marriage, and that adulterers were forbidden to marry (38).

---

(37) It is possible that Ydoine is here referring not to simple adultery, but to the impediment of crimen. See below, pp. 353-4.

(38) As we have already noted (above, p. 182), A. Fourrier finds evidence of a similar conservatism amongst the general public with regard to divorce, which was still practised in the twelfth century in cases of adultery and of the religious profession of one conjoint, even though the Church at this period proclaimed the absolute indissolubility of marriages in such circumstances. See Le Courant 261-278 (Paris, 1960), pp. 267-8 and 299-300.



## ii. Pre-marital unchastity.

In this section I discuss heroes who have non-marital sexual relations without committing adultery. As indicated at the beginning of this chapter, I am using the terms "pre-marital" to describe such love-affairs, and "extra-marital" for the adulterous affairs which we have considered so far.

The heroes whose "love without marriage" consists of a pre-marital sexual liaison fall into two groups. Firstly, there are those who engage in a protracted love-affair with a woman who is an enchantress, and who takes the initiative in the relationship; secondly, there are those whose period of pre-marital unchastity is relatively brief (lasting perhaps only for one night), and where the girl concerned has no magic powers or superiority in the relationship. In the first group, we find, for example, Partonopeus, Florimont and Guinglain, hero of Le Bel Inconnu; in the second group, Floire, Guillaume in L'Escouffle, Floriant and Cristal.

The first point to be noted about the heroes in the first group is that their love-affairs are indeed pre-marital, and not simply casual relationships. This is worth stressing, since neither Guinglain nor Florimont eventually marries the girl concerned, and the liaisons of these two heroes might therefore appear to be examples of what used to be called free love. That this is not so is made clear in each case by the heroine, who offers the hero her hand in marriage at the outset of their

relationship. There is thus an understanding that the couple are to be married, although their wedding-plans may not always be fulfilled.

In Florimont, the Pucele de l'Ile Celee approaches the hero after he has killed a sea-monster, and proposes to him as a reward for this feat:

2445	Vos avez mon anemin mort, Le mostre qui m'ait fet maint tort ...
2487	Je sui voir de l'Ile Selee Et por toi ai ge mer passee. En ma terre nen ait plus hoir: Se tu wels a moi remenoir,
2491	Tu serais rois de ma contree, Et je roÿne queronee.

Although marriage is not specifically mentioned, it is clearly implied by the picture of Florimont being crowned at the lady's side as king of Ile Celee. The proposal in the Bel Inconnu is similar; Guinglain kills Malgier, who is hated by the lady of Ile d'Or, and she proposes to him as soon as he is presented to her, although pretenders to her hand are normally expected to serve seven years for the privilege:

2269	De la caucie aval garder L'uissage vel cuite clamer. Por vos, sire, cuites serra, Que ja mais garde n'i ara.
2273	Et si ferai de vos signor; Ma terre vos doins et m'amor. A mari, sire, vos prendrai; Millor de vos certes ne sai.

It is only after this matrimonial understanding has been reached that these heroes become the lovers of the women concerned. The

case of Partonopeus is slightly different, since he finds himself in bed with Melior, and takes advantage of the fact, before learning that she plans to marry him (39). However, the author soon makes it quite clear that Partonopeus' affair is pre-marital, and the way in which Melior first announces her marriage-plans may have influenced the fairy's proposal in Florimont, with its similar emphasis on the kingdom to be gained through marriage (40):

1335      Ge sui de terre riche assés  
             Quant vint rois ai de moi casés...  
 1341      Tote Basence est mes empires;  
             Vos en serés et rois et sires  
             Se mon conseil volés tenir.

Further similarities between these three love-affairs are that the heroine in each case is skilled in magic, as we have already remarked, and that in Partonopeus and Florimont she refuses to be seen. The two latter are further linked in that this prohibition is infringed in each case by the hero's mother, or at her instigation. These and other similarities between these three works, and Marie de France's Lanval, are discussed by Hilka and by Fourrier (41), and there is no need for us to examine them in detail here.

(39) The seduction scene in Partonopeus (lines 1263-1320) is written with a splendid comic verve, to which P. Ménard's comments in Le Rire et Le Sourire dans le Roman Courtois en France au Moyen Age (Geneva 1969), p.270, do not do justice. The scene was later copied word for word by the author of Cristal et Clarie (lines 8329-8386).

(40) Although A. Hilka, on pp.CXI-CXII of the introduction to his edition of Florimont (Göttingen 1932), rejects the idea that Florimont was influenced by Partonopeus, this influence seems to me to be clearly demonstrated by A. Fourrier in Le Courant Réaliste (Paris 1960), pp.449-485, *passim*.

(41) As well as the pages of Hilka's edition of Florimont and of Fourrier's Le Courant Réaliste already referred to, see pp.448-9 of Le Courant Réaliste on Le Bel Inconnu and Partonopeus.

There is, however, one common factor in these three liaisons which is not brought out by the studies of Hilka and Fourrier, but which seems to deserve comment. In each case, we find that the hero's pre-marital affair appears to be incompatible with his pursuit of renown as a knight. Florimont, we learn, refuses to go and fight for King Philip because he is so besotted with his amie:

3737        Car il amoit muelz de s'amie  
              Le de(s)dui[t] que chevelerie.

Guinglain, it will be remembered, has to tear himself away from the fascinating lady of Ile d'Or in order to achieve the quest of the Fier Baisier which proves his knighthood and earns him his name (42). Later, while living at Ile d'Or, his only occupations are hunting and love-making (5319-5332); the news of the tournament at the Castiel as Puceles attracts him precisely because of his idle life:

5373        De l'aler grant talent avoit  
              Et molt couvoitous en estoit,  
              Car grant piece avoit ja esté  
              Que il n'avoit armes porté.

However, his pursuit of arms involves the inevitable loss of his amie. Although he is not recreant, as Florimont is, there is a clear contrast between Guinglain's pursuit of pris in the

---

(42) This theme is emphasised in other versions of the "Fair Unknown" story, such as the English Lybeaus Desconneus, where the lady of Ile d'Or is clearly represented as a wicked temptress leading the hero aside from the path of chivalry.

Arthurian world and his enjoyment of love at Ile d'Or, and there seems to be no possibility of reconciling the two. Similarly, in Partonopeus, the hero has nothing to do in Melior's kingdom except go hunting by day and enjoy his mistress' company at night (1887-1900). Only when he returns to France does he distinguish himself in battle, in the "Sornegur" episodes. Admittedly, it is eventually through his excellence in combat that Partonopeus wins the right to wed Melior, but it should be noted that, at this stage, the love-affair between them has ended, Melior having banished her lover after he has infringed her prohibition against looking at her (43). Before their marriage, Partonopeus earns pris in battle only when he is geographically or emotionally separated from his amie; while he is enjoying her favours in their pre-marital affair, he performs no feats of arms.

Taken in conjunction with the adulterous episode in Durmart, we thus have four heroes whose progress in chivalry appears to be hindered by an illicit love-affair, whether pre-marital or extra-marital. However, although the enjoyment of sex outside marriage certainly seems to be inimical to chivalry, a comparison with Chrétien's Erec and Yvain raises the question of whether any sexual fulfilment, whether inside or outside marriage, is not a

---

(43) Unlike the prohibitions in Lanval and Florimont, that in Partonopeus concerns the hero himself, who is not allowed to see his lady until she wills it. The theme is probably an adaptation of the Cupid and Psyche myth; see Fourrier, Le Courant Réaliste, p.385.

potential hasard to a knight's career, either turning him aside from the path of chivalry, or removing the spur which stimulates him to seek renown in battle (44).

The heroes who love enchantresses do not appear to see their actions as being in any way immoral. Only Florimont has any serious doubts about his relationship, but these are based on his unhappiness at the prospect of abandoning his own family in order to live with his lady in Ile Celee, and not on any sense that his liaison is morally wrong (2493-2508). Partonopeus, too, knows a moment of hesitation, but in his case this is caused by a superstitious fear that the girl in his bed may be a demon. Melior's invocation of the Virgin immediately removes his doubts (1159-64), which in any case are not concerned with the morality of making love to his unexpected bed-partner. Later, we learn that Partonopeus considers it would be a social failing — though not a moral one! — if he did not seduce Melior:

1263	Ceste dame dont je vos cant...
	Vers le vallet gisoit a destre;
	Or est tornee sor senestre.
1267	Li enfes jut grant piece en pais,
	Crient que ne le tegne a mavais,
	Quant ele s'est en pais temue,
	Se il vers li ne se remue.

---

(44) In this connexion, it is interesting to note G. Duby's finding that a knight's period as a juvenis, during which he was available for battles and tournaments wherever they might be held, lasted until he married and more especially until he had fathered legitimate children. See Duby's article "Dans la France du Nord-Ouest au XIIe Siècle: les 'Jeunes' dans la Société Aristocratique", Annales - Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations XIX (1964), p.836.

Guinglain, too, far from having moral scruples over his love for the lady of Ile d'Or, fears that his failure to enter his mistress' bedroom may be seen as a form of social cowardice:

4530        Irai je, u je remanrai? ...  
 4534        Se je remaig, je criem, sans faille,  
              Que ne me tiegne a recreant.

This lack of any sense that their actions might be frowned on by moralists parallels the amorality of the heroes who commit adultery.

Turning to our second group, the heroes whose pre-marital affairs are with normally-educated girls rather than with enchantresses (45), we find that their liaisons are not generally initiated by a specific proposal and invitation from the women concerned. Rather, their anticipation of the joys of the wedding-night is a mutual expression of love, based on the shared understanding that they are soon to be married (46). Thus Guillaume in L'Escoufle defends his compromising behaviour with Aelis on the grounds that they are betrothed (3022-3049). At this stage, it is clear (see lines 2375-9), the couple are in fact chaste;

---

(45) The magical skills of Melior and of the lady of Ile d'Or are the fruits of higher education: Partonopeus 4591-4614, Le Bel Inconnu 4930-4947.

(46) As indicated in the section on "The Formation of the "Marriage-Bond" in Part II above, formal betrothal vows had considerable force at this period, and were distinguished from marriage-vows only by being expressed in the future as opposed to the present. Moreover, a couple who consummated their union after a formal betrothal would, at some periods, have been regarded as fully married. Authors, however, generally seem unaware of this provision of canon law (the matrimonium praesumptum), although, as we shall see in the chapter on "The Heroine's Attitude to Love Without Marriage", it is possible that the author of Amadas exploits it.

later, however, when they are reunited after their adventures, and are to be married shortly, Jean Renart remarks that it would be as natural for them to share one bed as for a shivering man to sit close to the fire:

7876	De Guilliaume ne de s'amie Ne sai or comment il lor fu, Car cil qui siet tranlant au fu Se caufe volentiers de prés,
7880	Et li lit sont si prés a prés Qu'il n'i a, je cuit, c'unne plance.

We have already commented (above, pp. 118-120) on the natural way in which Floire and Blanchefleur consummate their love; in neither version of this poem is there any question of the superiority of the woman, or of her making a proposal and inviting the man to embark on a liaison with her. Similarly, in Floriant et Florete, the lovers reach a mutual understanding, sealed by the hero's gift of a ring; their nightly meetings in an orchard, though suggested by Florete and her lady-in-waiting, are not the result of a unilateral initiative on the part of the woman, but of a common desire to enjoy the solaces of love.

Another characteristic of pre-marital unchastity in these works is that it is not generally seen to be harmful to the hero's career as a knight. L'Escoufle and the "version aristocratique" of Floire are, of course, romans idylliques in which chivalry is not a relevant issue (though we may note that Guillaume is in fact knighted immediately after the nocturnal celebration of his reunion with Aelis). In the "version chevaleresque" of Floire, the hero clearly cannot perform feats of arms while locked with Blanchefleur



in the emir's tower; however, his bold defiance of the emir on their discovery (2928-2935), and his subsequent undertaking of the duel against Jonas, during which he is inspired by the sight of his amie (3075-3358), show that the author of this version did not intend to associate pre-marital unchastity with recreantise. In Floriant et Florete, both Floriant and Gawain enjoy nights of dalliance in the orchard; however, their prowess as knights does not appear to be affected, except by a tendency to oversleep in the mornings and so miss the king's war-council (4385-4400). In any case, their illicit meetings last for only a week, after which Floriant, like Floire in the "version chevaleresque", fights a splendidly victorious duel. As for Cristal, his pre-marital unchastity with Clarie is the affair of a single night, and has no effect on his attainments as a knight. It seems possible, indeed, that it is the relative brevity of all these liaisons (47) which explains the fact that sexual fulfilment in these works is not seen as inimical to knightly endeavour; a night or a week of pleasure would be unlikely to have the same effect as the months of idleness indulged in by Partonopeus or Guinglain.

Finally, we may note that these heroes are as unaware as the others of any moral opprobrium attaching to their unchastity; none of them shows any moral scruples about sleeping with his amie.

---

(47) We are not told how long Floire spends in the emir's tower in the "version chevaleresque": in the "version aristocratique", however, it is only a fortnight (line 2280).

In two of these works, however, the moral attitude of society to such misdemeanours is indicated by the fact that, on discovery, the hero has to marry his amie as soon as possible. These works are Floriant et Florete and Cristal et Clarie, in both of which the heroine has a father who objects strongly to her behaviour. In Floriant, Florete's father threatens to kill the knight who has dishonoured his daughter (4504-8), and is only mollified on learning that Floriant is noble, rich and a splendid fighter, and, most importantly, that he is to marry Florete (5503-5550). In Cristal, the situation is neatly reversed by the heroine, who succeeds in convincing her father that Cristal has not been in her bedroom, but then extorts his consent to their marriage on the grounds that no-one else will have her now that her reputation has been sullied by her father's "false" accusation that she has slept with Cristal (9023-9050). In both these works, however, the father's moral outrage is made to appear somewhat ridiculous, which enables the author to avoid throwing an unfavourable light on his hero's immoral behaviour.

In conclusion, then, we may say that heroes who engage in love outside marriage, whether adulterous or pre-marital, are not usually condemned from the point of view of Christian morality. Such love may, however, be criticised either implicitly or explicitly as being detrimental to the hero's progress in the path of chivalry. As for the Christian standpoint, it is evident when authors come to arrange the marriages of adulterous heroes to their amies, for these marriages are made to conform to canon law as far as the authors of the romances understand it.

### Chapter 3. The Hero's Attitude to Marriage Without Love

The previous chapters have shown that, in the romances we are concerned with, heroes generally seek the fulfilment of their love in marriage, since only marriage can provide the permanence and security without which love cannot be fully and freely enjoyed. Only where marriage is impossible do these heroes contemplate a permanent extra-marital union; and it is important to note that in such cases the liaison is thought of as being as durable as marriage, if not as secure. Such unions are in fact approximations to the ideal conditions of marriage, and not attempts to evade marriage or to put an extra-marital, "courtly" ideal in its place. Other examples of "love without marriage" are usually pre-marital affairs. In these instances, there is no question in the hero's mind of love and marriage not "going together" in the end : he simply anticipates the conjugal fulfilment of love. The fact that in some cases his hopes of an eventual marriage are disappointed does not alter the fundamentally pre-marital nature of his love-affair. Of our heroes, only Durmart enjoys the favours of a girl whom he does not wish or intend to marry. Only in his case is love thought of as an experience which can be completely separated from marriage.

As a corollary of this belief that love should naturally lead to marriage, heroes generally refuse to marry anyone they do not love. Such a refusal is, of course, very much to be expected in cases where the hero has a reasonably good hope of being able to

marry the girl he does love, and where he obviously does not want to jeopardize his chances by making a different alliance. Thus Blancandin has no hesitation in refusing the rich bride offered him by the king of Athens, because he knows that his love for L'Orgueilleuse d'Amor is fully reciprocated, and that he will be able to marry her if he can return to her in time (Blancandin 2488-2562). Similarly, Ipomedon jilts Daire's daughter because he knows that he would lose La Fièvre if he went through with the projected marriage:

7622	"Mestre", fait cil, "nel pus pas faire ...
7624	Vos savez ke mut ad grant pose
	Ke jo mut ai amé La Fièvre;
	Jo ne pus en nule manere
	De lui partir jor de ma vie,
	Kar sur trestutes m'est amie ...
7631	Si vos di ben, ke jo m'en vois:
	Peise mei, se plus arestois!"

Ipomedon, like Blancandin, is fairly sure that he has only to ask for his beloved's hand in order to be given it, and he thus has every reason for rejecting Daire's daughter. Despite her initial coolness, he knows from La Fièvre's behaviour during and after the three-day tournament that she wants to marry no-one but him, and the only obstacle to their union is his own quest for ever greater renown.

Guinglain is in a rather less hopeful position when he puts off Blonde Esmeree, for he has behaved badly to the girl he loves and does not know whether he can win her forgiveness. However, the Pucele as Blanches Mains had previously shown herself very eager to marry him (Bel Inconnu 2259-98, 2375-7) and his squire assures him that he has a good chance of recovering her favour (3807-24); the

prospect of a reunion with the Pucele is certainly good enough to justify Guinglain's tactful, though temporary, escape from Blonde Esmeree.

In these examples, the hero's refusal to marry a girl he does not love has practical effects, for he believes that in all probability he will eventually be able to marry the girl he does love, and wants to keep himself free for her. However, there are also romances in which the hero's decision to reject marriage without love seems more idealistic than practical, for his chances of ever being able to marry his true love appear very remote. In some cases, the hero is so devoted to a particular girl that he refuses to consider marrying anyone but her, even though she herself seems most unlikely ever to want to marry him. At its most extreme, this attitude has a burlesque element, as with Protheselaus, who rejects the Pucele Salvage (Protheselaus 4448-67), and later resists the proposals of the Dameisele de L'Isle at the risk of perpetual imprisonment (6592-6700), even though a false letter has assured him of the undying hatred of his beloved Medea.

Hue de Rotelande probably intended his hero's pointless sacrifice to have a comic effect (1), but the author of Sone de Nansay

---

(1) See D. Legge, Anglo-Norman Literature and its Background (Oxford 1963) pp. 85-96, in which the burlesque element in Hue's treatment of courtly love is analysed. The comedy of Protheselaus' situation is not noticed by P. Ménard in his book on Le Rire et le Sourire dans le Roman Courtois (Geneva, 1969). In his new edition of Hue's Ipomedon (Paris 1979), of which I have not at the time of writing seen a copy, A. J. Holden lays particular emphasis on Hue's "esprit foncièrement parodique et burlesque", according to the review by G. Raynaud de Lage in Romania 101 (1980), p.284.

seems to be quite serious when he describes how Sone's hopeless love for the cruel Yde prevents him from marrying any of the more available girls who subsequently cross his path. Sone has not the slightest reason for thinking that Yde's disdain for him will ever be overcome, yet for her sake he turns down the hand of Luciane of Saintois (Sone 2249-72), and resists the blandishments of the king of Norway's lovely daughter, Odee, whose father and mother both support her desire to marry him (7515-74, 7703-76, 7841-7942). The author apparently admires Sone's excessive determination to keep himself free for a girl who seems to loathe him; but the work is a late and mediocre one (2), and one should not expect too much from it in the way of plausibility.

However, irrational devotion as an obstacle to marriage is not found exclusively in satirical or second-rate works. Galeran of Brittany is similarly idealistic in different circumstances; convinced that Fresne is dead, he nevertheless rejects all the princesses suggested by Brun (Galeran 6400-13), and cannot even bring himself to marry Florie without much hesitation. So deep is his reluctance to marry anyone but his lost love, that he wonders whether this inward refusal may not invalidate his marriage in the eyes of God:

---

(2) J. D. Bruce considers that Sone belongs to "the latter part of the thirteenth century" (The Evolution of Arthurian Romance, vol. I, p. 350). He also states that the work is "tedious" (loc. cit.), a verdict which I would endorse.

6838 S'or te demande : "Veus la tu?"  
 Comment te peuz tu assentir  
 A respondre oïl sans mentir  
 Mauvaisement? Je ray en sens  
 6842 Que mariage fait assens.  
 Si je dy oïl, j'ai menty:  
 Si m'y ai je voir assenty,  
 Selon que on juge dehors.  
 6846 Comment pourra sentir mes cors  
 Le veu, quant je li mentiray?  
 Sans assentir l'assentiray,  
 En tant com Dieux juge dedens.

This passage, with its references to the doctrine that consensus facit nuptias (line 6842) and to the possibility of judging the same action differently according to the forum externum (line 6845) or the forum internum (line 6849), illustrates Galeran's dilemma in terms of canon law. Evidently, these legal concepts were well-known to Renaut, the author of the poem. He also, it would seem, expected his audience to share his knowledge, and to appreciate his use of the doctrines of consensualism and of the two fora to illuminate his hero's predicament. As I have indicated in Part II above, in the section on the impediment of Dissensus, cases like that of Galeran formed a fine subject of debate for theologians and canonists in the thirteenth century (3); from Renaut's romance, we see that such cases also intrigued the lay public. Renaut, moreover, decides the issue in a way which accords with contemporary Papal legislation, for he concludes his analysis of Galeran's feigned consent with an authorial exhortation :

6854 De li espouser ne s'encombe,  
 Car ce seroit faulce jointure!

---

(3) Galeran de Bretagne was probably written at the end of the twelfth century or in the first quarter of the thirteenth century; L. Foulet dates it c.1195-1225 on p.xxxi of the introduction to his edition of the text (CFMA 37).

This is in keeping with a decision of Pope Innocent III (1198-1216), who also settled a case of feigned consent in favour of the forum internum, as will be seen from the details given in the section of Part II on Dissensus. These references to contemporary canonical debate and legislation are an effective way of demonstrating Galeran's reluctance to marry Florie, for Renaut is able to show that his hero's reluctance is so strong as to constitute a diriment impediment, which would nullify the union if Galeran in fact went through with it.

Thus some heroes who have, it would seem, nothing to lose by marrying a girl with whom they are not in love, nevertheless reject such marriages. They take to extremes the principle that love and marriage are inseparable, by refusing to marry without love even though their refusal can bring them no benefit, since the girl they do love is lost to them. The principle which underlies such action is widespread in Old French romance, where many characters assume that one loses all hope of future happiness with one's beloved by marrying somebody else (4); but those who,

---

(4) Cp. S. Barrow, The Medieval Society Romances (New York 1924), p.40: "During the period of separation which proves the strength of the betrothal vows, one of the commonest tests is a counter matrimonial engagement... In the stories of love threatened by a loveless marriage, neither hero nor heroine is inclined to think lightly of the relation endangering their hopes. In every case it is abhorrent to them; apparently, the principles set forth by such authorities as Andreas do not enter into the lovers' distressed reasoning about it ... Neither the precepts of the De Amore nor the example of Tristan and Isolde serves to mitigate the sufferings of a lover subjected to the marriage ordeal." Barrow does, however, find one example of a minor character who does not see a loveless marriage as a calamity, but plans to keep her lover even after she is married.



having already lost their hope of happiness in love, nevertheless refuse all other marriages, exhibit an abhorrence for the idea of marriage without love which may seem extreme. It should perhaps be noted that, of the three heroes who adopt this attitude, only Protheselaus maintains it to the end. Galeran is gloomily prepared to go through with the unwelcome marriage when Fresne arrives at his court; Sone eventually abandons his pursuit of Yde when he learns that the Church itself forbids them to marry (5), and goes back to Norway to make the faithful Odee his bride at last (Sone de Nansay 16699-17054). Protheselaus, on the other hand, sticks by his refusal to marry la Dameisele de l'Isle despite all the pressure put upon him to yield. His resistance has a happy outcome; but, as I have said, his excesses of devotion are probably not intended to be taken seriously.

Other heroes who believe that there is no possibility of a union with their amies give more serious consideration to the suggestion that they might marry somebody else. Only one, however, goes so far as to marry the wrong girl. This is Guinglain, who

---

(5) The reason for the Church prohibition is the spiritual fraternity which results from the fact that Sone's mother had acted as Yde's godmother (Sone de Nansay 11103-8), thus bringing Sone and Yde into the relationship of brother and sister. As we noted above, in the section on Cognatio in Part II, this impediment was an extension of the impediment of consanguinity. In making this impediment responsible for Yde's otherwise inexplicable aversion to the hero, the author of Sone treats it as a mysterious and fatal taboo: however, this is unlikely to reflect the attitude of the generality of laymen towards a reasonably well-known impediment such as that of spiritual fraternity.

makes the best of a bad job when his second misdemeanour has finally estranged him from the Pucele as Blances Mains; he goes off to the tournament which the Pucele had warned him against on the grounds that

5350     ... la vos atent une dame  
           Qu'Artus vos veut donner a feme

and is soon married to Blonde Esmeree. His feelings for the Pucele do not prevent him from recognizing the advantages of a marriage with Blonde Esmeree, who is a great heiress (3385-94, 6174-9) as well as being very beautiful and very much in love with him. When Arthur points out all these factors, finishing up with the telling point that Blonde Esmeree is a lady who

6189     ... molt vos ainme et desire,  
           Si veut que vos soiés se sire,

Guinglain's mind is made up:

6193     Il vit la dame et biele et saje,  
           Se li plot molt en son corage.

However, Renaut de Beaujeu does not say at any point that Guinglain loves Blonde Esmeree; instead, he makes it clear that the hero's heart is still with the Pucele when he threatens to leave him "en tel esmai Que ja mais n'avera s'amie" (6260-1), unless his own lady is pleasant to him. Thus Guinglain, instead of eschewing any other match in the vain hope that the girl he loves will come back to him, sensibly marries another girl; he is not in love with her, but he finds her very attractive, and her love for him,

combined with her rich domains, offers him the chance of a happy and prosperous wedded life. This is in direct contrast to Sone and Protheselaus, who also have the opportunity of marrying beautiful, rich and loving girls, but who turn down this pleasant prospect because, unlike Guinglain, they insist on remaining faithful to another girl from whom they can expect neither love nor pity.

Gautier d'Arras' Ille also stops short of that extreme of devotion which consists in refusing to marry without love even though all hope of union with the beloved is lost. Once he has been convinced that Galeron is dead, he readily agrees to marry Ganor, dismissing the idea that he may be committing bigamy with a last exculpatory prayer (6). Like Guinglain, he accepts that it

---

(6) It is the Pope himself who pushes Ille into what may be a bigamous union, in order to secure his services as defender of Rome. Having warned Ille that his hopeless love for his lost wife is tempting him into the sin of despair (SATF 2892-2901), the Pope suggests sending messengers to search for Galeron. If she cannot be found, she may be presumed dead, and Ille will be free to marry Ganor. One of the messengers will be a Papal envoy, in order to give maximum credibility to the expedition's findings (2926-9). This is an accurate reflection of twelfth-century Church practice, in which the death of a missing spouse was readily presumed, once the ecclesiastical authorities had made a reasonably comprehensive search. The surviving partner was then free to re-marry. A problem arose, however, if the missing spouse re-appeared. In Ille, the Pope is aware that Galeron may still be alive, even though she cannot be found, and assures the hero that he, the Pope, will assume any sin there may be in Ille's remarriage (*S'il i a rien contre la loi,/ Trestolt le pecié prenc sor moi*, 2918-9). Ille, nevertheless, feels that his soul may be in danger (3083-7). On Papal dispensations from the impediment of bigamy in cases of prolonged absence of a spouse, see the section on Ligamen in Part II above.

it is pointless to remain faithful to someone whose love one has no chance of enjoying, and finds consolation in the prospect of marrying a rich and beautiful girl who is deeply in love with him, although he does not love her. Gautier makes the feelings of his three chief characters quite clear:

3365        Ganors ne veut se Ille non,  
              Ne Illes el que Galerons,  
              Ne Galerons qui est a Rome  
              N'ameroit pas por rien autre home.  
 3369        Illes si n'aime mie seus,  
              Car il est amés d'eles .ii.;  
              Mais il n'en aime pas que l'une.

(Quoted from Foerster's edition  
 of the Paris manuscript;  
 ms.W, SATF ed., lines 2528-34).

This passage, with Ille's lament for Galerons (Foerster 3884-3938; not found in ms.W) (7) and his restrained delight when she reappears (Foerster 4256-4362; ms.W (SATF ed.) 3347-3448) is ample evidence that Ille does not love Ganor when he agrees to marry her. Yet he goes ahead with the wedding preparations, showing rather less hesitation than does Renaut's Galerons in similar circumstances.

---

(7) As F. A. G. Cowper remarks on p.xxiv of the introduction to his edition of the Wollaton manuscript of Ille et Galerons (SATF vol.89, Paris 1956), it is possible that the two surviving manuscripts of the romance represent two different versions, one written for Thibaut V of Champagne and the other for the empress Beatrice, wife of Frederick Barbarossa. The Paris manuscript generally gives more details on Ille's relationship with Galerons than does the Wollaton manuscript.

Unlike Galeran, who can scarcely bring himself to marry even the twin sister of the "dead" Fresne, Ille resolutely puts the memory of his dead love behind him, and sees the advantages of marrying "le fille l'empereour, Ganor qui tant est jente et bele" (Foerster 4306-7, SATF 3399-3400).

However, the conviction that the heroine is lost to him is the only reason which can induce the hero to contemplate marrying a girl with whom he is not in love. A few heroes do, indeed, temporarily forget the heroine and plan to marry someone else; but in such cases, they think of marriage because they imagine themselves to be in love with the other girl. Such abnormalities may occur because the hero's mind has been totally confused by drink or drugs, or even (as in the regrettable instance of Guy of Warwick) because he has been so long away from the heroine that he has simply forgotten her; but in each case, a timely reminder of his one true love is enough to restore the hero's sanity, and put an end to such aberrations. He realises that he does not love the girl he is about to marry, and withdraws at once from the wedding preparations. Thus, in the case of Partonopeus, his mother and the king of France make him drunk in order to turn his thoughts from the dubious Melior to a more suitable bride (lines 3936-4047). He becomes so excited by the king's niece that he agrees to marry her. Although his feelings are more lustful than loving, it is clear that the idea of such a

marriage would never have entered his head without the illusion of love imparted by the drink and by the attentions of an attractive girl. The moment his new fiancée tactlessly mentions Melior, Partonopeus realises what he is doing and rushes from the room, preferring to break his betrothal vows rather than lose the chance of eventually marrying Melior:

4070        Sa foi a mise ariere dos.

The strength of the hero's aversion to a loveless marriage with the king's niece is indicated by this complete absence of hesitation in such a serious breach of faith. Betrothal vows were regarded at the period as being only slightly less binding than the marriage vow itself, as is pointed out on pp.59-61 of Part II, above. The author of Partonopeus shows us that, in this case, the betrothal was made with all the usual formalities, including the consent of both families, the establishment of dower and dowry (4031-4), the plighting of troth and the handing over of the fiancée. The hero himself is very conscious of the seriousness of the engagement he has entered into, as he tells Melior:

4177        Feme affai a grans honors,  
              A viles, a chastiaus, a bors.  
              Mais ains que foloiasse a li  
              Revint mes sens, si le guerpi  
 4181        Et ma mere et le roi de France,  
              Ne lor ting foi ne covenance.

Partonopeus' involvement in a loveless match,<sup>then,</sup> is shown to be a temporary aberration, induced by drink, and one which he totally abjures, despite the breach of faith involved, as soon as he has recovered his wits.

Drugs are used in the case of Gerart, hero of Ia Violette. He is given a love-potion which causes him to forget Euriaut and fall in love with Aiglante, whom he wants to marry (3404-3592, 4139-44). However, these marriage-plans are abandoned when the sight of Euriaut's ring recalls Gerart's true love to his mind (4219-4322). Natural love proves stronger than the love born of carraudes et sorcherie (4291), and Gerart abandons Cologne without even saying goodbye to the girl who expects to marry him. As in Partonopeus, the hero only thinks of marrying the heroine's rival because of an artificially-induced love for her, and flees the match as soon as he realises that it is, indeed, loveless.

Guy de Warewic is rather less excusable. He does not once think of Felice during his attempts to become the best knight in the world, even though the effort is being made for her sake. Instead, he grows steadily more interested in the idea of marrying Laurette, the emperor's daughter (2955-76, 3215-48, 4100-8). Once again, this marriage is associated with love, or at least the illusion of love, on the hero's part; Guy, we are told, kisses Laurette and talks with her par grant amur (3247-8). As in Gerart's case, it is a ring which breaks the

spell (8), but Guy has actually got as far as the wedding ceremony, and it is the sight of the wedding rings which recalls Felice to his mind (4225-40). Although he refuses to go through with the wedding, Guy does not, as do Partonopeus and Gerart, rush immediately away from all contact with the fiancée who is not his true love; instead, he lingers in Rome, and is so uncertain about the right course of action that he turns for advice to his friend Heralt. Finally, it is not love for Felice, but the slaying of his pet lion by the wicked seneschal, which decides Guy to leave Rome and the emperor's tempting daughter (4309-4454) (9). Such behaviour from the hero of a

---

(8) The significance of a ring as a reminder of the hero's true love when he is tempted by another woman links these episodes with the theme of the "Fiancé de la Vierge", to which we have already referred in connexion with the scene of wedding-night temptation in Athis et Prophilias (chap. 2 above, note 21). As P. Jonin points out in his study of this theme in Les Personnages Féminins dans les Romans français de Tristan (Aix-en-Provence 1958), pp.399-414, the ring which reminds Tristan on his wedding-night of Iseult la Blonde can also be connected with the "Fiancé de la Vierge" theme, in which the protagonist pledges his faith to the Virgin by placing a ring on a finger of her statue.

(9) Laurette is, it must be said, only part of the temptation which makes Guy reluctant to leave Rome. As well as the emperor's daughter, he has been promised half the empire, with the prospect of becoming emperor himself on the death of his father-in-law, since Laurette is sole heir to the realm. We have already commented (above, pp.136-7) on the reasons for the choice of a rich heiress as the hero's bride in so many texts.



romance seems surprising, and is certainly untypical, as we have shown. Guy de Warewic, it can be said, belongs rather to the male-oriented world of the chanson de geste than to the courtly tradition of octosyllabic romance. Indeed, the relationships between Guy and his companions Thierry and Heralt are so much more important than the love-intrigues that the Middle English version of the work was entitled Guy and Heralt. One's general impression of the work is that it is an inferior chanson de geste written in octosyllabic couplets, with a few of the most overworked themes of the romances thrown in as a concession to changing tastes.

Guy's difficulty in extracting himself from his commitment to marry Laurette incidentally draws attention to a feature common to many romances in which the hero is involved in a "counter matrimonial engagement". This is that the hero very rarely admits that the motive for his withdrawal is love for another woman. In Guy's case, he excuses his eventual departure on the grounds that he has killed his future father-in-law's seneschal, that life in Rome is very insecure when people like the seneschal can go around killing other people's pet lions, and that in any case he is not noble enough to marry the emperor's daughter (4433-82). Protheselaus, too, uses his lack of status and fortune as an excuse (4464-5), and even Ille, whose previous marriage gives him, one would think,

quite legitimate grounds for refusing Ganor, is very reluctant to explain the real reason for his initial rejection of her father's offer of her hand (<sup>ad,</sup> SATF 2735-2835). Guinglain uses his allegiance to Arthur as his pretext (3401-7, 3595-3634), and Sone alleges that he is not noble enough (7881-4), and that he feels insecure in Norway among a nation of drunkards and wants to go home to his family (7751-68).

The tortuous nature of some of these excuses betrays the deep embarrassment of so many heroes when refusing a most eligible match. This embarrassment is not necessarily caused by consideration for the feelings of the girl concerned, since it is also felt by those who, like Guy and Ille, are making their excuses to the girl's father and not to her. Possibly the heroes who behave in this way are following Andreas' rule that love should be hidden (the thirteenth of the Regulae Amoris). It is noticeable that heroes only admit that it is love which prevents them from marrying a different girl in cases where their love is already known, as happens with Partonopeus. The admission may also be made to a close confidant (Guy tells Heralt, Gerart tells his friendly host in Cologne), but not to the wider public of the girl's family and friends.

In conclusion, we find that the only hero in our chosen romances who in fact marries without love is Guinglain (10).

---

(10) Moreover the author, Renaut de Beaujeu, does not seem entirely satisfied with this match, since, as we know, he uses the threat of leaving Guinglain married to Blonde Esmeree and "en tel esmai/Que ja mais n'avera s'amie" (6260-1) as a way of extorting a "biau sanblant" from his own lady.

Others who are reluctantly prepared to do so (Ille, Galeran), are prevented by the last-minute reappearance of the heroine from going through with a union so contrary to the ideal of marriage for love. This ideal is, in a sense, less compromised by the attempted marriages of Partonopeus, Gerart and Guy, since in these instances the hero temporarily believes himself to be in love with the girl concerned. Sone, too, marries for love when he at last accepts the hand of the devoted Odee. Marriage without love, we see, is more generally rejected by the heroes of these romances than love without marriage, of which we found several examples.

---

(11) The hero's marriage without love is a rare phenomenon in Old French romance as a whole; the only other instance which readily comes to mind is that of Tristan. Even Tristan should, perhaps, be grouped with the heroes like Partonopeus and Gerart who imagine themselves to be in love with someone other than the heroine, and are hence tempted to marry the girl concerned. Marriage without love is more common in the case of heroines; see chapter 3 in Part IV, below.

#### Chapter 4. The Hero's Attitude to the Marriages of Minor Characters.

---

The previous chapter has shown that very few heroes accept the idea of marrying a girl they do not love. However, this idealistic insistence on love as a prerequisite for marriage is noticeably absent from heroes' attitudes towards the marriages of other people. One frequently finds that a hero who has staunchly upheld the ideal of marriage for love throughout a romance ends up by arranging marriages for his followers on totally different principles. In such cases, the author evidently feels no inconsistency in the fact that the champion of the cause of love should appear to neglect love altogether, and should arrange marriages for financial reasons or in order to ennoble his friends and relations. Thus we find Durmart commended because he

15506    Les povres chevaliers marie  
           As dames qui grans terres ont;  
           Les puceles qui povres sont  
           Fait prendre as riches amassés  
 15510    Ki terre et avoir ont assés.

Similarly, the Arsenal ms. of Partonopeus describes how the hero benevolently arranges the marriage of Gaudin and Persewis in order to reward them for their services. Although Gaudin in fact loves Persewis, Partonopeus does not know this, and he certainly does not think of the projected union as a love-match. Indeed, he has a shrewd suspicion that he himself is the object of Persewis' affections. He does allow for the possibility that the couple

may disagree with his plans, but his main objective is to make their fortunes through marriage:

Se bien lor plect et bon lor samble  
Als dels fera rices ensamble.

(Partonopeus, Arsenal ms. ed. Robert  
10487-8; Gildea ed., Appendix I, 1551-2)

The emphasis is all on the material reward which accompanies the wedding, and the idea of a union of two hearts is almost entirely absent from Partonopeus' thoughts. Yet the author evidently found Partonopeus' attitude admirable, an admiration reflected in the comments of his characters:

Dient li grant et li menor:  
"Molt avons bon empereor,  
Ne fu mais hom de son barnage.  
Deus maintiegne son segnorage!  
Qui tel segnor sert feelment,  
Rice gueredon en atent;  
Ne vait pas longes respirant,  
Mais gueredone maintenant.  
Cil n'a servi que trois jornees,  
Cui il a trois contés donees."

<sup>ms.</sup>  
(Arsenal, 10528-35; Gildea ed.,  
Appendix I, 1591-1600)

Again in Floire et Blancheflor ("version aristocratique"), we find the hero successfully leaving personal sentiment out of account when he arranges a marriage for his mother-in-law:

3025 Floires un duc a esgardé,  
Tout le plus riche de sa terre  
Et qui plus puet maintenir guerre.  
Au plus vaillant duc de s'onor  
3029 Donna la mere Blancheflor.

Here too, the hero sees marriage primarily as a means of bestowing material benefits and social status, and his action is recorded in a way which shows that the author found it highly commendable. Blanche-flor's mother herself is delighted by her good fortune:

3030        Estes la vous bien aïree;  
              Mout l'avra Fortune eslevee...  
 3034        Quant sa fille voit coronnee  
              Et ele est duchesse clamee,  
              A Damedieu graces en rent  
              Et sel mercie durement.

Presumably her new husband is no less happy to find himself made the father-in-law of the emperor, although his reaction is not given; in any case, one can assume that the author meant to present the marriage as a pleasant event with which to conclude his story. Thus it is perfectly acceptable for the hero to arrange a marriage for other people in which love is not considered to be a pre-requisite, and in which rank and wealth are seen as guarantees of happiness. Further examples can be seen in Ille, SATF ed., 5762-6 (ms. P, 6553-7), and in Jehan et Blonde. Here, the young hero marries off first his two sisters, then his squire Robin and the friendly sailor. In each case, he chooses a spouse of suitable social status, and pays attention to the financial security of the married couple, but none, apparently, to their personal feelings. His two sisters are married to two brothers, both "grans signeurs" (6111-6). For Robin and the sailor, Jehan chooses two sisters who, though their rank is not higher than that of their future husbands, have noble hearts and rich dowries, augmented by Jehan himself:

- 6119      A Dantmartin eut deus bourgeois,  
             Qui furent rices et courtoises;  
             N'estoient pas de cuer vilaines,  
             Disnes sont d'estre castelaines.  
 6123      Suers germaines andeus estoient,  
             Mout grant tere et grant meuble avoient.  
             De ces deus fist le mariage;  
             De l'ainee a Robin le sage,  
 6127      Et la mainee au maronnier.  
             Du sien leur donna maint denier.

The only love or affection which Jehan appears to have taken into account in arranging these marriages is that between members of the same family; in each case, we see that he chooses spouses who, being themselves brothers or sisters, will strengthen or extend the ties of family affection and loyalty between the couples concerned. These unions clearly reflect the contemporary concept of marriage as a bond between two families, rather than between two individuals, and as a contract where status and wealth are more important than private feelings (1). Yet, as in Durmart, Partonopeus and Floire, the inconsistency of the hero's attitude goes unremarked. Beaumanoir evidently sees these marriages as a way of including his minor characters in the story's happy ending, and as an illustration of Jehan's benevolent concern for his family and followers; it does not occur to him that Jehan's own status as a representative of the ideal of marriage for love might be in any way compromised by this happy ending or by this beneficence.

---

(1) The importance of the family group, the "amis charnels", in medieval society is underlined by J. M. Turlan in her article "Amis et Amis Charnels d'après les actes du Parlement au XIVe siècle", Revue Historique de Droit Français et Etranger 47 (1969), pp.645-698.

However, not all the heroes who arrange marriages for other people have such evidently benevolent intentions. Florimont, for example, arranges a purely political marriage between his son and Olimpias, the daughter of the defeated emir of Carthage. Admittedly, it is the emir who takes the initiative, but King Florimont's rôle is that of a statesman tying up a peace treaty, not of a father concerned for his son's happiness:

13455	Et quant li amiras fut pris, De fi cuidoit bien estre ossis; Por son cors garder de peril Donait Olimpias son fil.
13459	Olimpias fut marlee, A fil Florimont fut donee. Li amirals en fist le don A roi, a son fil Phelipon.
13463	Puels li dona em mariage Magalon, Iubie, Cartaige.

Thus Olimpias and a baby boy are married to each other out of sheer political necessity (2). The girl is given and received, like the emir's domains, in order to contract an alliance with Florimont, and thus save her father from the due reward of his evil deeds.

---

(2) We do not know the age of Olimpias; Florimont's son Phelipe is born shortly before his father's expedition against the emir. It was a fairly common practice for marriages to be arranged for very young children, particularly when reasons of state were involved, as here. By the end of the twelfth century, however, the Church recognised that such children could free themselves from the marriages made on their behalf once they reached the legal age of consent (twelve for girls, fourteen for boys). For further details, see the section on Dissensus in Part II above.



Although these examples show that love is often left out of account by the hero when arranging other people's marriages, the resulting matches do not, in fact, conflict with the personal feelings of the couples concerned (3). Love is not so much ignored, as simply irrelevant. There are other cases, however, where the hero seems to be guilty of overriding other people's feelings in an almost heartless way. Ipomedon, for example, assigns Ismene to his elderly tutor, although he himself has been the object of an ardent declaration of love by Ismene only a few weeks previously. The marriage is seen exclusively in terms of rank and wealth (Ismene is the heiress to the duchy of Burgundy), and is implicitly compared with other gifts of fiefs to faithful vassals:

10520	Li reis a ceus ki l'unt servi Ad mut ben rendu lur servise; A Tholomeu fist grant franchise: Il l'ad fet espuser Ismeine,
10524	Pus out Burgoine en sun demeine. Si reduna a Egeun La terre ki fut Amphiun.

---

(3) Only in the case of the child-marriage between Olimpias and Phelipe (the future Philip of Macedon) is there any suggestion that the resulting match is not a happy one. Aymon had, earlier in his story, reported a rumour that Olimpias became the lover of the enchanter Netanabus, the tutor of her son, Alexander, and that it was in fact Netanabus and not Philip of Macedon who was Alexander's father (3383-93). This rumour, however, is firmly denied by Aymon, who insists on the direct descent of Alexander the Great from his grandfather, Florimont. The slanders about Olimpias' chastity are also found in Alexandre de Paris' Roman d'Alexandre, Branch I, lines 145-194, where Netanabus is also mentioned; he is an astrologer-cum-male midwife who tries to ensure that Alexander is born under the most auspicious planetary aspect (Roman d'Alexandre, ed. E. C. Armstrong, L. Foulet et al., vol.II, Elliot Monographs 37, New York 1937). The association between Netanabus and the time of Alexander's birth, connected with the rumours about Olimpias' infidelity, may have suggested to Aymon that the slander about Alexander's illegitimacy concerned Netanabus.

Hue de Rotelande, it must be said, is not an author who pays much attention to his characters' feelings, and he is particularly insensitive about the emotions of the female figures in both his surviving romances. The author of the adapted ending of Partonopeu, found in the Arsenal manuscript, treats this type of situation with far more sensitivity; he shows the unhappy Persewis struggling to master her love for the hero, and turning to Gaudin as a possible substitute (Gildea ed., Appendix I, 1015-52, 1217-1364), before Partonopeus arranges their marriage. The hero's decision, in making which he gives thought to Persewis' feelings (1459-60), thus appears kindly and considerate, by contrast with the seeming callousness of Ipomedon. Another instance of disregard for people's feelings occurs in Blancandin, where the hero assumes the right to marry a captive Saracen princess to his friend Sadoine, and gives not a thought to the girl's possible objections to marrying her conqueror. However, the marriage turns out to be a happy one; like so many Saracen princesses, the girl has already fallen for the handsome enemy (Blancandin 2698-2704; 3413-3424; 3686-3715).

Thus we find that even those heroes who stand out most strongly for their own right to marry for love are prepared to treat love as a secondary consideration where other people are concerned. When they arrange rewarding marriages for their family and friends, their primary consideration is not the personal

qualities which may inspire love, but the impersonal attributes of wealth and rank. They do not see the most desirable sort of spouse as someone particularly attractive and good-natured, but as someone outstandingly rich and noble. Although very few heroes go so far as to arrange a marriage which actually conflicts with the personal preference of the people concerned, they do tend to leave sentiment out of account, and to assume that the couple's preference will in any case go to the wealthy partner picked out for them. In this way, the hero tacitly admits that mutual love is not an essential requirement for a successful marriage, and that the most important criteria are riches and social status.

This paradox becomes even more striking when one considers that often the same hero has earlier affirmed that one should not marry for money, or else has rejected a rich girl in favour of a poorer one whom he loves. Thus Ille abandons the chance of becoming emperor of Rome in order to keep faith with his beloved Galeron, and is quite aware that in so doing he is consciously setting love above material gain (and, as we saw in the previous chapter, above the attractions of another woman):

4271      Amie, ne me decevés!...  
             Se je laissoie tot ce plait  
             Por vostre amor, qu'en seroit fait?...  
 4303      Contes refusastes et dus  
             Por moi: je ferai por vos plus;  
             Car j'en refuserai l'onor  
             Et le fille l'empereour.

(Quotation from Foerster's edition:  
 cp. SATF 3364-7 and 3396-9).

Ille, we should note, makes this choice of his own free will; he is not constrained to stay with Galeron as his legal wife, for she has already announced her intention of entering a convent in order to free him for his new marriage (Foerster 4145-59, 4209-39. Cp. SATF 3262-76, 3328-46) (4). In the same way, Ipomedon turns down the beautiful Ismene, who offers to marry him and so make him lord of Burgundy, because he loves La Fiere of Calabria; and he thus shows that he considers love to be more important in marriage than a great inheritance, for the rejected Burgundy "valt plus de Calabre asez" (Ipomedon 8876-9194). As for Floire, he refuses even to consider the advantages of rank and wealth where his own marriage is concerned, attaching importance to love alone and despising worldly gain ("version aristocratique" 860-903). Yet all three adopt the opposite values when arranging marriages for other people, and the author deals as approvingly with their conduct on such occasions as with their earlier contempt for riches.

---

(4) As A. Fourrier points out in Le Courant Réaliste (Paris 1960), pp.299-300, the belief that a spouse who entered religion became dead to the world, and thus freed his or her partner to make a new marriage, was very persistent in the twelfth century, even though the Church no longer accepted that a marriage could be dissolved by monastic vows. Gautier, however, "se conforme ici à l'ancienne coutume mérovingienne, qui survivait encore plus ou moins de son temps et qui admettait parmi les causes de dissolution du mariage... l'entrée en religion de l'un des deux conjoints... L'Eglise tolérait... la retraite au couvent des deux époux, décidée d'un commun accord ob servitium Dei, ou bien elle autorisait l'un des deux à s'y retirer, à condition que l'autre fût suffisamment vieux et fût voeu de chasteté. Mais, si telle était la théorie, la pratique était loin d'y correspondre toujours et les moeurs retardaient sur les principes de la doctrine." (Fourrier, op. cit., p.299). See also pp.55-8 of Part II above, on the establishment of the principle of indissolubility in such cases.

This inconsistency springs from two sources. The first is that the couples thus married off are minor characters with whose feelings we have not been greatly concerned during the preceding narrative. In some cases, they appear in the story at this one point only, and are introduced for the sole purpose of illustrating the hero's generosity, as in the example quoted from Durmartin<sup>and</sup> L'Escoufle 80-83, where count Richard

Maint chevalier fist de noient  
Riche et manant en son eage  
Par biax dons et par mariage.

In other instances, they have played a useful supporting rôle, and deserve to share in the happy ending; the author therefore marries them off as a convenient way of tying up loose ends, and stresses the prosperousness of the match because it seems to him to be the most obvious sign that these minor characters, like the hero they served, lived happily ever after. In neither case is the author particularly interested in the emotional life of the characters concerned, and this lack of interest is reflected in the hero's materialistic attitude to their marriage.

Secondly, the hero who arranges marriages for his followers is not seen primarily as a good lover, but as a good lord. By the time he comes to settle the futures of his friends and family, his love-story is over; he has won his bride, and in all probability won a great inheritance with her. The author now sees him in a new rôle, that of the ruler of a domain and the overlord of many vassals.

As he had previously been concerned to show that his hero was a paragon of love, he is now equally concerned to portray him as an ideal duke or emperor (5). One of the virtues of the lover is his contempt for material values when opposed to love; but one of the most important virtues of the lord is his generosity in giving material rewards to those who have served him, and his concern for the prosperity of his subjects. A good lord, as we see from the passage from Partonopeus quoted above, was one who earned the love and fidelity of his vassals by rewarding them richly for their services to him. Liberality is a virtue which writers scarcely ever fail to mention when describing such a man; they regard it as being essential for the health of the state (6).

Moreover, the lord had the right to sanction the marriages of his vassals, and even to insist on a marriage being made in cases where a fief was not being served by a man capable of bearing arms (7). Such powers could easily be abused by lords who put their own interests above those of their vassals. An author

---

(5) One notices that the hero is often referred to at this stage in his career not by his name, but by his title. Thus Jehan is "the count" after his marriage (Jehan et Blonde 6079, 6087, 6999, 6131), and Florimont is "the king" (Florimont 13448, 13462, 13468, 13488), as is Ipomedon (Ipomedon 10520).

(6) See M. Bloch, La Société Féodale, (Paris, 1939), Volume I, pp.223-60, which shows how the structure of feudal society was built on the gifts of fiefs made by lords to their vassals, and how the lord's generosity was also essential for those vassals he maintained in his household.

(7) See the section on Vis in Part II above for a summary of the lord's rights over the marriage of his vassals, and especially over his female vassals.

therefore had two good reasons for describing the material benefits which the hero conferred on his subjects by the marriages he arranged for them. In the first place, the rich marriage-partner could be seen as a fine reward handed out by a generous master; and in the second place, the hero's readiness to find wealthy spouses for his poorer vassals illustrated his liberality and his concern for the well-being of his subjects. The use of his power to arrange marriages in a way that benefitted his vassals rather than himself was a sign that the lord truly cared for his people; in Durmart, for example, the marriages brought about by the hero are quoted amongst such charitable works as the founding of abbeys, the maintenance of widows and poor people, and the supporting of those who are disinherited (Durmart 15504-28). Similarly, we read that Jehan and Blonde

6151	Les povres nonains releverent, Les povres femes marièrent, As bons ki vaurrent honour quere Donerent et deniers et tere,
6155	Mout honorerent sainte eglise.

Thus the hero who, once he himself has married for love, appears to forget love and to look on marriage as a property transaction, is acting as a beneficent overlord, and as such is regarded with approval by the author. One can perhaps see this volte-face as an indication of the slight degree to which social institutions were really influenced by the literary fashion for love-marriages.

Chapter 5. The Hero's Attitude to his Future Bride's Wealth  
and Status.

In the cases examined in the previous chapter, we have seen how a hero may sometimes treat love as being of far greater importance to his own marriage than to those of other people. We have also noted that this inconsistency generally seems to spring from the author's failure to weld together his two views of the hero, who acts at one moment as an ideal lover, and at another as an ideal lord.

However, the discrepancy between the hero's two standards of behaviour may often pass unnoticed, since the marriages he arranges in his capacity as an overlord usually concern minor characters and occupy a few lines only, while his own marriage has been the pivot of most of the romance. Moreover, the hero's activities as a lord do not usually coincide in time with his actions as a lover; the one follows the other, and this too may blur one's perception of the opposition between the two concepts of marriage.

There are, however, some works in which the contrary ideals of marriage-for-love and marriage-for-profit are found side by side. This occurs in those romances where the author does not gloss over his hero's feelings about the lands and money he will gain by marrying a rich heiress. As I have already noted (above, pp.136-143), one does indeed find that the heroines of romance are frequently great heiresses, but in many cases the author, wishing to portray



his hero as a truly disinterested lover, says little or nothing about that hero's attitude to the wealth which he stands to gain by marrying the heroine (1). Those authors who do deal with the hero's awareness that his marriage will be profitable often find it difficult to resolve the resulting conflict between the materialistic and the sentimental views of marriage. The extent to which they succeed in reconciling the two depends not only on their skill, but also on their awareness of the fundamental irreconcilability of the profit motive and the love motive.

We shall look first at Eneas, Guillaume in L'Escoufle, and Partonopeus, three heroes whose attitude to the lands and wealth to be won through their marriage is made explicit, and then more briefly at those who show scant awareness of the profitability of their marriages.

---

(1) The incompatibility between mercenary motives and true love is stressed by the theorist of fine amors, Andreas Capellanus, in Cap. IX, Book I of his De Amore: "Verus igitur amor ex sola cordis affectione procedit et ex pura gratia et mera liberalitate conceditur. Pretiosissimum namque munus amoris nullius potest pretii aestimatione pensari vel argenti dehonestari substantia." (De Amore ed. Trojel, 2nd edition, Munich 1964, p.224). In John Jay Parry's translation: "Real love comes only from the affection of the heart and is granted out of pure grace and genuine liberality, and this most precious gift of love cannot be paid for at any set price or be cheapened by a matter of money." (The Art of Courtly Love, New York 1959, p.144).

One of the earliest examples of a conflict between pure love and materialism in the hero's approach to marriage occurs in the Lavinia episodes of the Roman d'Eneas (2). As J. J. Salverda de Grave points out in the introduction to his second edition of Eneas, the romance is an adaptation rather than a translation of Virgil's Aeneid (3). One of the most original features of this adaptation is the incorporation of a large amount of material from Ovid into the story of Eneas' marriage to Lavinia, turning it from a purely dynastic marriage into a love-affair (4). It seems that the Old French author, finding little trace of love-interest in Virgil's characterisation of Eneas at this point, decided to exploit the possibilities of the Eneas-Lavinia-Turmus situation by developing a love-story between Eneas and Lavinia (5). However, he did not succeed in adapting Virgil's portrayal of a land-hungry Eneas to fit his new picture of the hero as a love-lorn suitor, and as a result we find strange variations in Eneas' attitude.

---

(2) Eneas was probably written between c.1155 and c.1165. The only octosyllabic romance to have come down to us from a possibly earlier date is the Roman de Thèbes, which contains a potentially similar situation to that of Eneas and Lavinia in the marriage of Edipus and Jocasta; here, however, the hero's feelings about his marriage are not analysed.

(3) Le Roman d'Eneas vol.1 (Paris 1925), p.xxi. (CFMA vol.44).

(4) See M. Paral, Recherches sur les Sources Latines des Contes et Romans Courtois (Paris 1913), pp.126 ff., for a detailed analysis of the themes borrowed from Ovid.

(5) Miss H.C.R.Laurie has suggested that it was Virgil's portrayal of Lavinia's lover, Turmus, which originally inspired the author of the Roman d'Eneas to turn Eneas himself into a lover ("Eneas and the Lancelot of Chrétien de Troyes", Medium Aevum 37, 1968, p.142). This idea seems to me to be very plausible, since it explains why there is no similar treatment of the Dido episode.

Before Lavinia's message has awakened love in his heart, Eneas' attitude to his marriage accords closely with Virgil's picture. He thinks of the land he is to be given, and of the race of kings he will found, but pays little attention to the bride who is to be the instrument of his success and glory. When Anchises prophesies that he will marry Lavinia and father a line of emperors, he is only concerned with his descendants:

2987      Molt se fait liez de sa ligniee  
               Qu'il voit qui tant ert escauciee  
               Que li monz ert vers lui aclin.

In seeking help from Evander, he again makes no mention of his bride; he speaks only of the land of Latium, which is promised him by the gods but contested by Turnus (4711-28). These traits are closely modelled on Virgil, where Eneas is fired by Anchises' demonstration of the future glory of his line (Aeneid VI 888-9), and solicits Evander's aid on the grounds that Turnus has unlawfully attacked him (Id. VIII 117-8, 146-9), as well as the grounds of his own distant kinship with Evander.

Where the author of the romance departs from his model in order to describe the love of Eneas and Lavinia, there is a definite change in Eneas' approach. Suddenly he realises that he is fighting for a wife as well as for a kingdom, and his thoughts about the duel with Turnus centre on the chance of winning Lavinia herself, rather than her father's lands (Eneas 8935-9104).

later, cursing himself for not having claimed Lavinia immediately after his victory, he gives vent to a long monologue in which he expresses his love for Lavinia, and his longing to marry her as soon as possible (Eneas 9927-10078). In these passages, Eneas is seen simply as a lover, whose concern is with winning his darling's hand and with preserving her love. Thus the medieval author gives two conflicting views of his hero's motivation, and does not attempt to reconcile them.

One might argue, as does Helen Laurie, that Eneas' inconsistency is "not a confused but a complex inner state", leading to "a revelation within the character himself" when the hero discovers he is in love (6). This, however, only explains the initial dichotomy between Eneas the fortune-hunter and Eneas the lover, and leads one to expect that, once he has realised the importance of love in his life, Eneas' behaviour will become psychologically consistent and comprehensible. Unfortunately, Eneas' subsequent behaviour does not fulfil such expectations. He continues to act at one moment as though he is only interested in Lavinia's inheritance, and at other moments as though her love is all that matters to him, in a way which betrays the author's lack of success in fusing together his two concepts of the hero. Nor can one blame the conflict in Eneas' character entirely on the confusion arising when the medieval author adapted his Virgilian prototype to fit a new mould, that of the sighing lover. The most striking example of inconsistency in the characterisation of Eneas occurs

---

(6) Art. cit., p.142. Laurie expresses herself somewhat obscurely, but I believe I have divined her meaning correctly.

in an episode which owes nothing to Virgil: the passage where Eneas, having fought and defeated Turnus in order to win the right to marry Lavinia, receives the homage of his new bride's barons and then goes straight back to his own camp, without even a glance at Lavinia herself (9815-38). Like the poor neglected heroine, the modern reader finds this conduct hard to understand in an ardent lover; Lavinia herself is convinced that Eneas does not love her after all, but is interested only in the lands guaranteed him by the barons' homage (9839-50, 9893-9917). Presumably the author arranged this improbable behaviour as an excuse for including two more monologues from the distressed lovers, but in so doing he ignored the fact that Eneas' expressed sentiments towards Lavinia are completely at variance with his conduct (7).

Earlier, when the medieval author, following his Latin model, recounts Eneas' pre-battle speech, there is another inconsistency. Eneas rehearses his claim to the land (Eneas 9347-76), and then adds a promise that he will make no attempt to disinherit Latinus in his lifetime:

9387	Bien vos promet, fait il al roi, Tant com vivroiz, que ja par moi Ne seroiz descreüz de rien: Vostre terre maintenez bien,
9391	Mes donez moi a une part, O vostre fille, par esgart, Ou faire puisse une cité; Aprés vos aie l'irité.

---

(7) It is interesting to note that the author of the adapted version of Eneas represented by the late fourteenth-century ms. D (printed as Appendix I of the CFMA edition) seems also to have found Eneas' attitude unsatisfactory. His alteration is basically an attempt to make the hero appear more genuine as a lover, by softening the effect of his neglect of Lavinia once he <sup>has</sup> won the right to marry her.

Here Lavinia is once again pushed into the background by the territorial question - probably because, in the corresponding passage in Virgil, she is mentioned only as the eponymous queen of Eneas' new city (*Urbique dabit Lavinia nomen*, *Aeneid* XII 194). As Helen Laurie notes (*art. cit.*, p.143): "Latinus, Turmus, Eneas himself in all other parts of the poem [except in love-monologues] habitually refer to 'la terre et la fame' as if Lavine were a mere chattel." Laurie is probably right in thinking that this shows that the idea of marriage for love "evidently [had] little to do with contemporary practice."

Eneas therefore seems to have two quite distinct attitudes to his marriage. The first is that of the opportunist, eager to seize the inheritance he gains through marriage, but indifferent to the bride herself; the second is that of the lover, longing to be united with the girl he loves and unable to bear even the week's delay which the opportunist gaily grants. The discrepancy between these two views can be attributed largely to the fact that they come from different sources. The view of marriage as a dynastic and territorial manoeuvre was taken from Virgil, and from twelfth-century practice, while the idea that marriage is the fulfilment of love was supplied by the Old French author himself. However, he did not succeed in reconciling the two views - possibly because, as one of the earliest experimenters in the field, he was not fully aware of the extent to which they conflict.

However, lands and riches had, in the middle ages, as in other periods, associations which lifted them out of the realm of the purely material; they meant nobility, honour and power (8). The word honor could refer either to the dignity of holding a fief, or to the fief itself (9); and lands, wealth and nobility were all associated with power (10), which in its turn commanded respect and honour. Authors could, therefore, evade the conflict between marriage-for-love and marriage-for-profit by stressing the hero's desire for honour, rather than for riches. Such an ambition would clearly be easier to conciliate with altruistic love than would a simple interest in lands and wealth. Nevertheless, the close association of the concepts of honour and riches might still create difficulties, since the one inevitably suggested the other. In practice, we find that there are few authors who give their heroes a positive interest in winning high rank through marriage, any more than they overtly covet the heroine's wealth.

---

(8) In La Société Féodale (second edition, Paris 1949), vol. I, pp.223-260 and 293-304, M. Bloch has described the historical processes which led to the identification of rank, power and riches in an age when "la véritable fortune était de tenir rang de maître" (op.cit.p.297).

(9) TL vol.6, col.1133: "Onor: Besitztum, Herrschaft, Lehen (vgl. fief)"; col. 1135: "Onor: Regierung, hohes (weltliches oder geistliches) Amt." Similarly, FEW vol.IV p.465: "Afr. honor: 'considération, bonne réputation, estime du monde ... distinction qui honore.' ... In übertragenen Bedeutung: 'fief; bien en general'". See also M. Bloch, op.cit. pp.296-7, where the evolution of the Carolingian "honneur" (high office) into something indistinguishable from the "bienfait" or fief which was the official's salary, is described.

(10) The connexion between power and wealth is clearly illustrated by the etymology of the word riche. According to E. Gamillscheg (Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Französischen Sprache 1968 p.772), riche developed from the Germanic \*riki, "mächtig, gewaltig" and in Old French meant "mächtig, kraftig" as well as "reich". See also FEW vol.XVI pp.712-5, where the derivation from \*riki, "mächtig", is described as "Afr. rice: puissant, noble, pourvu de grands biens et de droits de commandement".

One poem which does deal frankly with the hero's desire to share his bride's noble status is L'Escoufle, and this work provides our second illustration of the problems of combining such frankness with a portrayal of the hero as a disinterested lover. With his characteristic eye for the practical and the down-to-earth, Jean Renart gives a realistic picture of Guillaume's feelings on losing the chance of becoming emperor of Rome. There is no pretence that Guillaume is not interested in the empire; indeed, he is so dazzled by his great prospects that he gives short shrift to the emissaries who ask him to take up his father's inheritance in Normandy: 9/

3500 Mais, dame, la hautece ou g'ere  
Ne me laissoit pas acorder  
A rien qu'il seüssent mander,  
N'onques n'en voil oïr proiere.

Here, the emphasis is on the nobility of Guillaume's position in Rome, which puts him above taking an interest in the lesser honour of being count of Montivilliers (11). Only when deprived of the promised title does Guillaume turn to the spurned Norman county, as he tells Aelis:

3508 Et jou rai puis perdu de Rome  
La grant honor qui m'ert promise.  
Fortune a ml't grant paine mise  
A moi trebuchier de si haut.  
3512 Quant sens ne eürs ne m'i vaut,  
Ne je ne vos puis mais avoir,  
Si me convient par estavoir  
En Normandie aler par tens,  
Car g'istroie fors de mon sens  
Se je veoie autre home avoir  
Ceste honor et vos et l'avoir  
Que vos peres m'avoit promis.

---

(11) It is possible that Guillaume's refusal of the county may be a reflection of the custom noted by F. Lot and R. Fawtier, (Histoire des Institutions Françaises au Moyen Age, vol.II, Les Institutions Royales (Paris 1958), p.103), whereby the Capetian kings considered themselves bound to divest themselves of lesser titles on their accession to the monarchy. This custom was still observed by German emperors in the twelfth century. Such a supposition would explain Guillaume's rejection of Normandy on the grounds that his rank makes it impossible for him to accept a lesser honour.



This passage makes it clear that Guillaume not only wants the dignity of being emperor; he wants the riches which accompany the title as well, and does not clearly distinguish the two in his mind. His dual use of honor gives us an insight into his attitude to Aelis' inheritance, and shows that he sees it both as a cachet of nobility and as a source of income. In line 3509, he seems to be thinking of the prestige of being Emperor, while honor in line 3518 refers to the empire itself; yet in neither case can one say that the one sense excludes the other. The two are inseparable in Guillaume's mind, for obviously he cannot hold the rank of emperor without at the same time enjoying possession of the empire, with all its riches (avoir).

Still more significant is the fact that Guillaume's regret for the lost wealth and status equals his regret for Aelis herself, as we see in line 3518. He thus appears as eager as Eneas to lay claim to a rich bride, and the fact that he clearly desires honour as much as wealth does not make him seem any more disinterested than the landless Trojan. In an earlier passage, Jean Renart evidently felt that such a frank admission of interest in the heroine's property needed to be qualified, and rather awkwardly introduced a declaration that Guillaume really cares only for Aelis herself, and not for her inheritance. Asked by Aelis why he seems so depressed, Guillaume replies that he feels he has lost her, adding, in a bitter outburst:

3398        Et quant tele honor et tel bien  
               Ai perdu com d'estre emperere,  
               Comment porroit nus nés de mere  
               Avoir grignor duel qu'est li miens?

He then hastily corrects himself:

3402 Certes, moi ne chaut por les biens,  
 Ne por l'onor, ne por la terre,  
 K'encor em puis assés conquerre...  
 3408 Avoirs, richece ne tresors  
 Ne me porroit faire avoir joie.  
 Comment cuidiés vos je m'esjoie  
 Qui ai perdu si grant honor (12)  
 3412 Que tot mon cuer, tote m'amor  
 Ai mis en vos sans traire arriere?

Thus Jean Renart shows himself more conscious than the author of Eneas of the fundamental contradiction between marriage for love and marriage for profit, and makes an attempt to reconcile the two. He did not wish to portray his hero as a mercenary young man, but he did seek to give a realistic description of the feelings of someone in Guillaume's position (13). The difficulties he encountered in conciliating this realism with the hero's ideals as an altruistic lover are obvious enough to show us why so many other writers preferred to portray the ideal only, and to play down the real interest which a relatively poor young man might naturally feel in the rich domains of the girl he hopes to marry.

---

(12) The use of honor in line 3411 contrasts with the instances noted above (lines 3509 and 3518) in that it is not directly connected with Aelis' domains. Instead, it comes nearer to the modern use of "honneur" in the sense of a distinction which confers esteem on the holder; Guillaume has the honour of being Aelis' lover. In this way Guillaume shows a respect for his beloved's high rank, a respect which, as we shall see, is felt to a much greater extent by some other heroes in similar situations.

(13) Jean Renart's realism, and the difficulties into which it leads him, are overlooked by M. Lot-Borodine in her otherwise perceptive study of L'Escoufle in Le Roman Idyllique (Paris 1913). Commenting on the scene to which we have just referred, she concludes that Aelis is "toute fière et heureuse" because she "voit que Guillaume ne peut se consoler de la perdre et que ce n'est pas le trône futur qu'il regrette" (my italics).

However, before turning to the romances in which the hero expresses little or no positive interest in the heroine's wealth and status, let us consider a work which has a different method of avoiding the conflict between the hero's material and emotional gains through marriage. This is Partonopeus, where the author, without laying much emphasis on the hero's appreciation of the heroine's wealth, nevertheless touches on it lightly, and in a way which adds realism both to his characterisation and to his plot. Partonopeus does not in fact say that he himself wants to marry Melior for her money, but he uses her riches as an argument to persuade his mother that the marriage is a most desirable one (3881-3898). Nor does he praise Melior's wealth for its own sake alone; he values it because it brings peace and honour, enabling him and his mother first to recover the loyalty of their defecting vassals (2035-2078), and then to live in a state befitting their rank, as he points out:

3891      De li me vient li grans richece  
              Dont nos menons ceste noblece.

Partonopeus' interest in Melior's riches is thus presented as a well-judged reaction to his mother's criteria of a good marriage as one which brings wealth and status, rather than as a piece of fortune-hunting on his own part. Although he personally wants to marry because he is in love, Partonopeus is capable of seeing the importance of money to other people, and the incident affords the author an opportunity to demonstrate his hero's tact and good sense, as well as a subtle way of showing the difference between Partonopeus' attitude and that of his mother.

The fact that Partonopeus is capable of appreciating the importance of a rich dowry is significant for the episode which follows his conversation with his mother. As we noted in Chapter 3 above, she plots with her nephew Lohier, the king of France, to separate Partonopeus from his "bele fee" by marrying him to a different girl, and it appears that the king's

4032                   ...molt biaux otrois  
                       Et de castiaus et de cités  
                       De viles et d'onors assés

as a dowry bears some weight with Partonopeus. Certainly he is impressed enough by the offer to confess to Melior that

4177           Feme affai a grans honors  
                   A viles, a chastiaus, a bors.

The author makes good psychological use of Partonopeus' sense of the importance of riches in this episode, since it provides an additional motive for the hero's temporary forgetfulness, and makes his agreement to the marriage more plausible.

Thus in Eneas, L'Escoufle and Partonopeus, the hero openly appreciates the material possessions to be won through marriage - Aelis' empire, Lavinia's lands, Melior's treasure, or the fiefs to be granted with Lohier's niece. Eneas' interest in the lands he will gain through marriage seems at times to be stronger than his interest in his bride, and he strikes the reader as an uneasy compromise between an idealistic lover and a hard-headed adventurer.

Guillaume has none of Eneas' inconsistency, and is, indeed, a consistent and successful portrayal of a young man whose adoration for his fiancée does not blind him to the material advantages of marrying an heiress; such realism, however, was difficult to reconcile with the hero's function as a perfect and disinterested lover, as we have seen. Both Eneas and L'Escoufle demonstrate the difficulty faced by authors who took account of the hero's interest in his future bride's wealth and status. Partonopeus offers a solution to the difficulty, by relegating the financial advantages of marriage to a subordinate place in the hero's interests: Partonopeus praises Melior's riches only in order to dazzle his mother, and his attitude to Lohier's well-endowed niece turns finally into a triumph of true love, since he abandons her for Melior.

However, in the majority of romances in which the hero marries into money, authors deal with the difficulty in another way. Firstly, they avoid giving the hero any explicit awareness of the heroine's wealth, so that, although he loves a rich heiress, the hero seems to attach no importance whatsoever to his amie's lands and money. Instead, authors take advantage of the bond between wealth and rank to make their heroes concentrate on the honour of the heroine's high station, rather than on the terre et avoir which bestow such prestige. This, however, as we have seen in the case of Guillaume, is not in itself sufficient to guarantee that the hero impresses the audience as an ideal lover, free from any trace of self-seeking or mercenary motives. Authors therefore take a further step; since it is through marriage that the hero

would rise to the heroine's rank (14) and gain control of her riches, he is made to take no interest in marriage. As we have remarked in Chapter 1, the author's desire to avoid presenting the hero as a man who covets the heroine's wealth and status is one reason why so many heroes appear indifferent to their own chances of a future marriage. Let us now look in detail at the psychology of a few such heroes, in order to show how the transference of the hero's interest in the heroine's riches into a veneration for her high social rank, which in itself gives him a strong appearance of disinterested love, can be further exploited by authors to motivate the lover's failure to press for marriage.

One of the most striking examples of this respect for the beloved's rank is Gautier d'Arras' Ille, who falls in love with the sister of his overlord. He is deeply impressed by Galeron's high station in life, and the thought of his own comparatively low birth makes him lament that:

... Ne li caut mie  
 Qu'ele a tel home soit amie,  
 N'a moi, que soie ses amis.

Ms. P., Foerster ed., 1309-  
 1311. Not in ms. W (SATF ed.)

---

(14) The acquisition of high rank through marriage probably had two sources. The first was canon law, which, declaring that a couple become one flesh on marriage, derived from this a secondary principle, that a married couple automatically had the same rank (E. Chénon, Histoire Générale du Droit Français vol.2, (Paris, 1929), p.97). Under normal circumstances, the wife would probably take the husband's rank, whether higher or lower than hers; but, where her status was reinforced by the inheritance of a noble fief, a second factor, the idea that "le fief anoblit le vassal", came into play, and caused the husband to take his wife's rank by virtue of the fief for which he did homage. (Chénon, op.cit. pp.2-3).

His love is "trop haus a desmesure" (ms.P 1368; not in ms.W), and he can no more expect it to be fulfilled than expect to be made Emperor (Ms.P 1322-33; not in ms.W). Even when Conain comes to offer him his sister's hand, Ille cannot believe that so noble a lady would consent to marry him - especially as she has already refused two counts and a duke :

Mais il n'ert ja espoir sofert  
Endroit de li k'ele me pregne  
Des qu'ele mul de cex n'adaigne.

Ms.P 1504-6; Ms.W 904-6.

Thus Ille regards his marriage to Galeron as an undeserved honour to which he could not hope to accede except through the grace of Galeron and her brother. "Ainc nel desservi a nul jour" (P 1485, W 889), he tells Conain; and later, describing the circumstances of his marriage:

Ne sai que vit en moi li dus.  
Moi le dona; mervelles fist  
Et ele gregnor, qui me prist;  
Qu'au fil mon pere n'ataint mie  
Qu'ele li fust feme n'amie.

Ms. W(SATF ed.) 2847-51;  
Ms. P 3677-9 (last 2 lines omitted).

In all Ille's reflections about his love for Galeron, there is scarcely a hint of the idea that, as her brother's heir, she will one day be a rich woman. He does not think of her as a bride who will bring a duchy as her dowry, but sees her as his dameisele, a noble lady whose inheritance means that she will eventually be his suzerain. As Conain's sister, she is already far above "li fix

Eliduc"; as his heir, her superiority over Ille, her future vassal, is given form and weight by the traditions of the feudal hierarchy (15). Thus Ille sees her inheritance as a reinforcement of the social gulf between them, not as a possible source of wealth and power for himself. Indeed, their social disparity impresses him so deeply that he dares not think of becoming Galeron's husband. He cannot believe the marriage is possible even when the duke himself suggests it, and does not dream of making such a suggestion on his own account; the idea of marriage is absent even from his private thoughts, and Gautier d'Arras shows us convincingly why this should be so (16).

Ille is, of course, more conscious than most heroes of the social superiority conferred on his lady by her rich domain. As J. P. Collas points out (art. cit., p.90), Gautier d'Arras "set out to undermine the marriage of his hero on purely psychological grounds", and Ille's sense of inferiority is the essential element of the break-up. However, several other heroes adopt a similarly humble attitude, and one can often interpret their feelings in the light of the detailed analysis given by Gautier.

(15) In an article, "The Romantic Hero of the Twelfth Century", contributed to the Miscellany in Honour of E. Vinaver (Manchester 1965), pp.80-96, J. P. Collas draws a parallel between Ille's "hypersensitiveness" about his rank and the attitude shown by characters in chansons de geste who have been wronged by their overlord (p.90). The comparison is illuminating, since it traces Ille's insecurity to a definite source - his sufferings under Galeron's father, the "foibles dus".

(16) Ille is not similarly inhibited by his low status when he later has the chance of marrying the daughter of the Emperor of Rome. In this case, however, he is not in love with the girl concerned, and there is therefore no need for Gautier to play down the hero's legitimate interest in fame and fortune in order to present him as an altruistic lover. Once he has fallen in love with Ganor, Ille no longer thinks of her domains as a prize he personally could win through marriage, but adopts a humble attitude towards her (SATF 4754-8, 5653-4) and speaks only of love, waiting for her to mention matrimony (SATF 5655-8, 5678-83).



Guillaume de Palerne, for example, also sees his amie's inheritance as the symbol of her inaccessibly high rank. His Melior is so noble that the greatest in the land could not presume to offer her his love, and Guillaume is only a waif who does not even know who his father was; in such circumstances, it is sheer madness for him to think of loving her:

1207 Com mes cuers est plains de grant rage  
 Qui onques a si fait outrage  
 Osa penser, n'a tele error,  
 N'a tel fille d'empereor  
 1211 Et ma damoisele demaine!

Even when he knows that Melior returns his love, Guillaume still retains his respect for her high station, and this naturally prevents him from daring to think that he might marry her.

Yet another instance is that of Philippe de Remi's Jehan. On first realising that he is in love with his master's daughter, Blonde, Jehan thinks despairingly of the impossibility of so noble a maiden ever being his:

562 Et bien me doi por fol clamer  
 Qui aime en lieu dont ja nus biens  
 Ne me devra venir por riens.  
 Se li rois n'avoit point de fame,  
 566 Il penroit volentiers ma dame,  
 Car contesse iert d'Osenefort.  
 Je n'avrai pas vaillant tant fort.  
 Comme ele avra de deniers d'or.  
 570 Et s'ele n'avoit nul tresor  
 Fors que sans plus sa grant biauté,  
 Si seroit une roiauté  
 A son aferant trop petite.

Here we see that Blonde's rich prospects do not make Jehan hope to marry such a wealthy bride; instead, they imbue him with such a sense of her superiority that he is led to exclaim that even a kingdom would not be good enough for her. Everything about her -

her lands, her treasure, her beauty - makes Blonde so inaccessible that Jehan's love seems hopeless, and he thinks of her with the humility of one whose total possessions will never be worth as much as the gold pennies in her coffers.

Other heroes who appear to find the heroine's wealth and status an inhibition to any thought of marriage, rather than a prize to be won, are Guinglain, Florimont, Fergus, Ipomedon, Meraugis and Yder. Not all of these make their inhibition explicit, but in most cases it is clear that the author is adopting the mechanism we have outlined : in order to prevent his hero seeming mercenary, the author gives him no apparent awareness that the girl he loves is rich, and makes him instead intensely conscious of another aspect of her status as an heiress, namely her exalted position in society. Penetrated by the sense of his darling's social superiority, the hero thinks of her lands and riches simply as the attributes or symbols of her nobility; it scarcely occurs to him that such things are worth having for their own sake, independently of the dignity they confer on the one he loves. Still less does he consider that he himself might possess such wealth, for to do so would be to set himself up as the equal of one whom he venerates as his lady. Far from taking it as his right, like Jean Renart's Guillaume, to be made master of an empire by marrying the girl he loves, such a hero often treats the elevation in rank which follows on his marriage as a signal favour bestowed on him by the princess who has deigned to become

his wife. Instead of calculating the material benefits to be won from marriage, he contemplates the exalted position of his beloved, and wonders how she can be persuaded to return the affection of someone as humble as he. Such an emphasis on the status conferred by rich domains is thus perfectly compatible with the portrayal of an ideal lover, for it leads the hero to adopt the currently fashionable pose of a humble suppliant for his lady's favour.

## Chapter 6. The Heroine's Nobility: An incentive to marriage

---

for the hero of "riche cuer".

For the type of hero discussed at the end of the previous chapter, the high rank of the heroine inspires such respect that he scarcely presumes to think of himself as her future husband. However, there are instances in which the heroine's exalted status has the opposite effect: it inspires the hero with the desire both to demonstrate and to increase his own worth and renown by making her his bride.

Such an audacious reaction to the nobility of the heroine may arise in varying circumstances. If, like Ille or Florimont in their early dealings with Ganor and Romadanaple respectively, the hero has not yet fallen in love, he may well be bolder than his more deeply enamoured fellows. If, like Durmart, he is as noble as the girl he loves, his lover-like humility may be tempered by pride of birth to produce a combination of modesty and boldness (1). In either case, his attitude will be based to a large extent on the tendency to equate nobility of birth with nobility of character, and to link both with fame or reputation.

The equation between noble rank and noble character, which is fundamental to most of the works we are concerned with, is clearly expressed in Andreas Capellanus' De Amore, particularly

---

(1) This is not always the case; in Escanor the hero, Kay, is as noble as the heroine, but love makes him so fearful of her that he is completely tongue-tied in her presence.

in the first three dialogues. These dialogues deal with the plebeian man, and show him arguing that he is worthy to love a noblewoman because of his nobility of heart. In the second dialogue, for example, we find the man stating that: "ex bonis tantum moribus et hominis probitate ac curialitatis fomite a primordio fuit orta nobilitas." (2). He then argues that: "si me morum probitatis cultura perlustrat, intra nobilitatis me credo moenia constitutum et vera generis coruscare virtute, et sic me morum probitas intra nobilitatis ordinem facit esse repositum" (3). The importance of renown and public esteem in establishing one's claim to innate nobility is less clearly evident in *Andreas*, possibly because his protagonists are scarcely ever seen as members of a social group. However, the link between merit and reputation can be demonstrated by a brief examination of the concepts of valor and pris.

A glance at some dictionary definitions will show that both these terms contain the idea of worth or merit. Amongst the definitions given for pris in TL is "(hoher) Wert", and in Godefroy we find "valeur morale". Foerster's Wörterbuch zu Kristian von Troyes gives "Wert" for both pris and valor, and "von Wert sein" for valoir; valor is defined in Godefroy as "mérite, qualité, perfections." As well as the idea of worth,

---

(2) De Amore, ed. Trojel, p.45. Translated by J. J. Parry in Andreas Capellanus, The Art of Courtly Love (New York, 1941, republished 1959), p.48, as: "nobility came in the beginning only from good character and manly worth and courtesy."

(3) Ed.cit., p.47. In Parry's translation, ed.cit., p.49: "if I have cultivated a character excellent through and through, I think that puts me inside the walls of nobility and gives me the true virtue of rank, and so my character puts me among the nobles."

that of reputation is also associated with both pris and valor.  
TL gives "Ruhm, Lob" as well as Wert" for pris, and in FEW we  
 find for valor "ce qu'une personne est estimée pour son mérite".

Thus pris and valor have similar meanings, which could well  
 be rendered by the phrase "renommée mondaine et valeur morale"  
 used by M. Lazar to define the Provençal expression pretz e valor (4).  
 However, as M. Lazar himself points out, it is unwise to assume  
 that Provençal terms necessarily mean the same as their equivalents  
 in the langue d'oïl (5), and it seems to me that the distinction  
 made by E. Wechssler, which Lazar rejects as being too precise for  
pretz e valor, may well apply to pris and valor: "Pretz est  
 l'estimation subjective, dont une personne jouit; Valor, la valeur  
 objective qu'une personne possède" (6). Certainly the idea of  
 renown or reputation is stronger in pris, while valor emphasises  
 merit and worth: at the same time, both terms cover aspects of  
 both renown and merit, a dual connotation which can, in some cases,  
 be translated as "honour" (7). Only through public esteem is  
 innate merit recognised, and the hero who aspires to high rank,  
 which in itself commands public esteem, must cultivate noble  
 qualities and ensure that his resulting honourable reputation is  
 widely known.

---

(4) Amour Courtois et "Fin'Amors" (Paris, 1964), p.32.

(5) Op.cit., pp.17-18.

(6) E. Wechssler, Das Kulturproblem des Minnesangs, (Halle 1909),  
 vol.I, pp.123-4, quoted by M. Lazar, op. cit., p.32.

(7) Cf. W. Foerster, Wörterbuch zu Kristian von Troyes: "Pris...  
 Ehre, Auszeichnung". The relationship between renown and merit is  
 also noted by J. Huizinga, who remarks in The Waning of the Middle  
 Ages (London 1927), p.59 : "The passionate desire to find himself  
 praised by contemporaries or by posterity was the source of virtue  
 with the courtly knight of the twelfth century".

Thus a knight who is not of the highest social class may hope, like Andreas' plebeian, to win a lady of far higher rank than his own, and set out to gain pris in order to deserve her (8). Alternatively, he may see the winning of the lady as being in itself the factor which will bring him pris. If he can marry her, he will have achieved the social rank which accords with his innate nobility, and his marriage will give public recognition to his private virtue. Such an enterprising attitude to a bride of wealth and status can be detected in several heroes, of whom Florimont is perhaps the best example.

On his arrival at the court of King Philip, Florimont is too proud to serve patiently for three years, as other knights have to, before being allowed to see the king's daughter, Romadanaple. He demands to see the princess straight away, and does so in order to increase his own honour and esteem among his companions (5731-5774). (Florimont, though the son of a duke, is at this stage destitute, and has joined the company of Prince Risus and his knights). Marriage is not explicitly mentioned, but Romadanaple herself clearly understands that Florimont has come for her sake. She also correctly interprets his request to see her immediately as a sign of his courage, or nobility

---

(8) Unlike the heroes of our romances, Andreas' protagonists do not, of course, aim at marriage. However, in other respects their views on paying court to a noble lady can be compared.

of heart (9) :

5643           ... Bien sai et voi  
               Que il est si venus por moi.  
               Se il ait pris de vaselaige  
               En seu avrai ge grant damaige.  
 5647           Sa proësce me serait dans,  
               C'il ne me voit davant trois anz.  
               Mai se il avoit riche cuer,  
               Il ne remandroit a nul fuer,  
 5651           Se il davant ne me veoit.

Thus Florimont's riche cuer leads him to set himself up as Romadanaple's suitor, and he does so for honour's sake, in order to earn the esteem of his noble companions and to show that, despite his poverty, he is as noble as they. As his tutor puts it:

5767           Pus li princes vos ameroit  
               Et volentiers vos serviroit,  
               Et trestuit li atre asiment.  
               Si avroit bel acoentement;  
 5771           Honor[s] et prous vos seroit grans.

Later, we find Romadanaple again commenting on Florimont's riche cuer, which is in itself an estimable quality, and which has inspired him to come to her father's land in search of pris:

7530           Se il est de petit paraige,  
               Povres de terre et d'avoir,  
               Por ce doit grinor los avoir;  
               Car a riche cuer et por pris  
 7534           En est venus en cest païs (10).

---

(9) This interpretation of the phrase riche cuer is based on the definition of riche given in L. Foulet's Glossary of the First Continuation (Continuations of the 'Perceval', ed. W. Roach, (Philadelphia, 1949-71), vol. III, part 2): "riche...indique tout d'abord une idée de puissance, de force...Naturellement ces puissants sont individuellement des gens hardis et courageux". I have also used the evidence of Aymon's use of riche elsewhere in Florimont; for example, line 641, where Philip shows riche coraige (courage, boldness) in fighting a lion on foot, and line 4610, where Florimont's riche coraige (noble heart, courage) can be read in his face, despite his shabby appearance.

(10) The importance of Florimont's riche cuer and pris in Romadanaple's eyes is discussed in Part IV below, Chapter 5.



However, once Florimont has fallen in love with Romadanaple, he shows less boldness in his wooing of her, and instead adopts the humble attitude of the heroes discussed at the end of the previous chapter (11).

The concept of riche cuer is found again, in a similar context, in Ille et Galeron. Ille does not actively seek out Ganor, the emperor's daughter, in the way that Florimont makes his bid for Romadanaple; instead, it is Ganor's father who offers his daughter's hand to Ille. The negotiations are conducted by the Pope, who points out that to refuse such a fine marriage would be to demonstrate the opposite of riche cuer:

3578	Avés vos dont si povre cuer? En' est prœce vostre suer? En' est largece vostre amie Et malvaistés vostre anemie?
3582	Savés quel preu vos en arois? De canque vos sossiel sarois, Que tient cist emperere nostre, Ert des or mais la moitié vostre,
3586	Et si arés avoec la rente Ganor qui si est bele et jente Et de par li tote l'onor Aprés la mort l'empereor.
3590	En' a dont chi rice novele?

(Quoted from Foerster's ed.;  
SATF ed. lines 2746-2758).

Clearly, the Pope expects Ille to have a heart bold and noble enough to aspire to become emperor through marriage. Instead of

---

(11) See, for example, lines 8050-1, "a moi que taint/A ameir jai fille de roi?" and lines 8125-9, "C'ele fust de petit paraige,/Bien li deIsse mon coraige;/Mai ele est de tel signorie/Qu' moi n'ataint de tele amie".

being overawed by Ganor's high position, he should proudly accept the rank and riches to be bestowed with her, since they are, by implication, the due reward of his qualities of proëce and largece (lines 3579-85, quoted above). Ille later agrees to the marriage, with none of the sense of inferiority which he showed when in love with Galeron (12). Ganor's wealth and status, which Ille will acquire by marrying her, are presented by Gautier d'Arras as a public acknowledgment of his hero's great qualities, and as a way of giving Ille a station in society commensurate with the nobility of his character and deeds. As the Pope puts it, Ille's "social connexions" among the virtues are of the highest - proëce is his sister and largece his friend (lines 3579-80, quoted above), - and for Ille to become Emperor would simply be to translate these high moral connexions in terms of the social hierarchy.

Ille's modesty, which Gautier has made a key element of his character, prevents him from actively seeking to demonstrate or increase his pris by marrying Ganor. Very different is young Blancandin, who, before falling in love with Orguellose d'Amor, sees her purely as a valuable prey who will bring him both pris and a good income if he can marry her. Blancandin has set out from home in order to seek los et pris. A chance-met knight, learning

---

(12) In the Paris ms., as edited by Foerster, Ille himself asks the emperor to carry out his promise to marry him to Ganor (lines 3941-5). The syntax here, however, is not clear (see line 3939), and the Wollaton Hall ms. has a much better reading, in which it is obvious that it is the emperor, and not Ille, who is demanding the fulfilment of the promise. Since such a self-assertive request would be out of keeping with Ille's character, it seems probable that the Paris ms. is corrupt at this point.



The speaker here is, obviously, Orguellose herself, and her words show that Blancandin's grant cuer must be a sign of his nobility of birth, which has bred in him a heart noble and bold enough to dare to kiss so high-born and haughty a damsel.

The link between the heroine's nobility and the hero's desire to increase his renown by making her his bride is most clearly seen in Durmart. As we have noted, the hero of this romance has two contrasted love-affairs. In the first, he falls for the wife of a seneschal, and forgets about chivalry and renown in her arms; she is "La dame...Por qui je perdoie mon pris" (855-6). Durmart's second love is the heroine, a queen for whose sake he undertakes deeds which will increase his worth:

3666	Que il pensoit atant valoir
	Que quant la roine sara
	Les proïces que faites a
	Et ce qu'il entreprenent por li,
3670	Tost le tenra por son ami. (14)

The heroine is presented from the outset as a suitable bride, and, as we saw in Chapter 2 above, the author implies that it is the adulterous nature of Durmart's youthful relationship with the seneschal's wife which makes his love for her so incompatible with the pursuit of knightly renown. However, Durmart's father, often the spokesman for the author's values in this romance, points out

---

(14) As we pointed out in Chapter 1 above, pp. 123-6, Durmart is another of the many heroes who consistently refers to love, and not to marriage, although his intention from the start is to make Fenise his bride, if he can.

another flaw in his son's adolescent love-affair, a flaw which is also connected with the failure of this affair to inspire Durmart to perform noble deeds. Not only is Durmart's mistress the wife of another man, but also she is of lower rank than he:

860 N'est pas amors de fil a roi  
Vers la feme d'un vavassor. (15)  
Filz de roi doit avoir amor  
A haute pucelle roial  
864 Ou a roïne emperial.  
Mais vavassor et bachelor  
Cil doivent haut et bas amer;  
De fil a roi n'est pas ensi.

---

(15) It may seem strange that a seneschal is presented as someone whose rank is no better than that of a vavassor, a man who, "vassal de beaucoup de vassaux (vassus vassorum), n'est lui-même le seigneur d'aucun autre guerrier." (M. Bloch, La Société Féodale (Paris 1949), vol.II, p.78). However, as B. Wledge points out in his article "Bons Vavasseurs et Mauvais Sénéchaux", Mélanges Lejeune (Gembloux 196 ), p.1267: "l'expression de vavassor était commode, et peut-être courante pour indiquer un certain mépris des choses ou des personnes dont on ne tenait pas grand compte." Moreover, the man concerned is not the king's second-in-command, who would presumably be called the "seneschal of Wales" by analogy with similar officials in courts in France (see F. Lot and R. Fawtier, Les Institutions Seigneuriales (Paris, 1957), p.41 (Anjou), p.210 (Burgundy), p.272 (Brittany), and pp.379-380 (Flanders)). Instead, we are told that he "De la Blanche Cité estoit/Sceneschaus" (Durmart 151-2). Furthermore, in lines 1016-7 we read that several seneschals served at a feast in the Welsh court; our man was not the only bearer of the title. It therefore seems that the author of Durmart was thinking of another kind of seneschal appointed in Flanders or Anjou from the mid-12th century onwards, who was the administrator only of a particular region, and also in charge of provisioning his lord's court when it was domiciled in his area. Such a seneschal would be the keeper of a castle in the way that the seneschal in Durmart has charge of the Blanche Cité. (See J. Boussard, "L'Empire Plantagenêt", Les Institutions Seigneuriales p.44; L. Ganshof, "La Flandre", id. pp.379-381 and note 7, p.380). Since the author of Durmart was a Picard speaker (Gildea, Durmart vol.II, p.90), he may well have used the men who were ministerii victualium nostrarum to the counts of Flanders as his model; or he may have attempted to introduce some local colour by copying the administrative system of the Plantagenets. Similar officials were also appointed by the kings of France from the late 12th century onwards, charged with overseeing provosts and dispensing justice. Like the seneschal depicted in Durmart (an upright and cultivated member of the lower nobility), these men belonged to "la petite noblesse, qui a fait des études universitaires et prouvé sa fidélité au roi"; Beaumanoir was such an official. Known as baillis in the North, these officers were called sénéchaux in the South of France. See F. Olivier-Martin, Précis d'Histoire du Droit Français, 5th edition (Paris 1955), §§ 446-450.

The importance of this difference in rank is brought out by the comparison with the Irish queen, Fenise. Unlike the seneschalcece, she is so noble that the knight who hopes to deserve her love must be of outstanding worth:

1625      Se vos le volés desrainier,  
             Grant fais vos covient enbracier,  
             Quar mout doit al siecle valoir  
             Qui si haut amor vuet avoir.

She herself uses the link between high birth and merit as a reason for accepting Durmart's proposal:

14858      Cil doit bien avoir haute amie  
             Qui hautement l'oze conquerre,  
             Mais ne doit hate amor requerre  
             Nus hom qui deservir ne l'ose...  
 14867      Se vos avés m'amor requise,  
             Vos l'avés hautement conquise.

Here, Fenise plays on the dual sense of haut/hautement in a way which corresponds to English "noble/nobly". Referring to herself as a haute amie, she uses the word to express the superiority of her rank and the distinction of her person; Gildea translates haute here as supérieure (Durmart glossary); and TL gives for haut "von hohem Stande, hochgestellt, erhaben, vornehm". In order to win such a noble love, Durmart must deserve it by his noble deeds; the sense of hautement corresponds to Gildea's gloss of "dignement, brillamment" and to TL's "in ehrenvoller Weise...trefflich, vorzüglich". Thus Durmart has nobly won the right to Fenise's love by the high feats of valour he has performed for her sake, and

particularly by his most recent and widely-known exploit: the defence of her castle against the combined forces of the wicked Nogant and of king Arthur himself (16). In this way Fenise is the opposite of the seneschal's wife, who thinks an untried squire eminently worthy of her love:

299        Vos estes sages et vaillans  
           Et bealz et juvenes et plaisans;  
           Puis que vostre amors m'est donee,  
           Ne puis estre miech assenee.

As Durmart's social inferior, the seneschalcesce is flattered to have him for a lover, and accepts his suit immediately (283-314); he needs to make no effort to win her, and therefore her love does not inspire him to pursue knightly renown.

However, Durmart does not only seek glory in order to deserve Fenise. Before he knew of her existence, he had already made up his mind to achieve renown:

848        De mule rien en tot cest mont  
           N'ai ju si tresgrant desirier  
           Con de mon pris a avancier.

---

(16) In his article "Vues sur les conceptions courtoises dans les littératures d'oc et d'oïl" (CCM II, 1959, pp.135-56; reprinted in J. Frappier, Amour Courtois et Table Ronde, Paris) J. Frappier points out that such an emphasis on military prowess is one of the features which most sharply differentiates the Northern ideal of love from its Provençal counterpart (p.145). Nevertheless, as R. Nelli remarks (L'Erotique des Troubadours (Toulouse, 1963), pp.63-5), the Provençal romances of Jaufré, Flamenca and Blandin also embody the ideal of amour chevaleresque. It seems, however, that this is due to an imitation of northern French literature, rather than to an independent Provençal development of the "heroic" aspects of Arab love-poetry — the source on which M. Nelli insists.

This decision is an important stage in Durmart's development.

At the end of the romance, the author tells us that he has written it in order to encourage the nobles of his own day to perform deeds which will earn them lasting renown like that of Alexander or Arthur (15911-79):

- 15945 De lor pris et de lor valor  
Chantent et content li plusor  
Por ce que de haute onor furent;  
Puis que lor non encore durent,  
15949 Dont vos di je bien sens envie  
Qu'il valurent mout en lor vie.  
Chascuns hauz hom se doit pener  
Qu'il puist en tel guise finer  
15953 C'on doive son non retenir;  
Cant il covient l'ome finir  
Et ses nons muert ensemble o lui,  
Je conte por noient celui. (17)

Hence the way in which Durmart acquires pris is central to the author's theme. With this in mind, it is interesting to note the terms in which Fenise is first described to the hero:

- 1149 Roïne est et vos filz de roi;  
Si avenroit bien que vos doi  
Eüssiés ensemble ajostees  
Vos deus beatés et assemblees. (18)  
1153 Et certes, s'ensi avenoit,  
Trestos li mons en parleroit,  
Si en seriés de plus halt pris  
Se de s'amor estiés saisis.  
(My italics).

(17) The use of pris, valor, onor and valoir in this passage is a good example of the close link between the senses of these different words. One also notes the connexion between all these terms and the idea of renown, here envisaged as posthumous fame.

(18) The words ajoster and assembler used in lines 1151-2 could apply to marriage in Old French: Tl ajoster "trauen, vermählen", assemblee "eheliche Vereinigung", assembler "zusammankommen (ehelich)". Gildea gives simply "unir" for ajoster in this passage, but it seems clear both from the development of the romance and from the author's use of assembler elsewhere in the work that marriage is meant. In lines 14875-9, Fenise uses assenbler and assemblee unequivocally of her marriage to

Durmart:  
Et Deus nos doinst si assenbler  
Qu'a tot le monde puist senbler  
Que bone soit nostre assemblee.  
Jamais ne soit desassemblee  
Nostre compaignie a nul ior.



Fenise is, therefore, so noble and beautiful that Durmart's renown (pris) would be greatly increased if he could win such a paragon as his bride. Since he wants above all else to enhance his pris, Durmart is captivated by the idea of winning a wife whose outstanding birth and beauty will spread his fame through the whole world. Fenise's rank does not intimidate him, since he is himself a prince; instead, it makes him eager to increase his reputation by an alliance with one whose worth and nobility are above question (19).

Thus the romance of Durmart provides us with an interesting and carefully-presented example of the way in which the high rank of the heroine can serve as a spur to the matrimonial plans of the hero. The author's avowed purpose in composing the story was to encourage noblemen of his own generation to practise the chivalric virtues which would win them renown long after their death. To do this, he set out to tell the story of a man of high birth who did indeed achieve such renown. An important factor in the winning or losing of knightly glory was the hero's attitude to love. Much influenced by the themes of Chrétien's Erec and Yvain, the author of Durmart attempted a fresh definition of the relationship between love, marriage and chivalry. Where Chrétien had made Enide the source both of Erec's backsliding and of his return to honour, the author of Durmart distinguished between the

---

(19) Fenise's worth, unlike Durmart's, does not have to be won or demonstrated; it is already self-evident in the perfection of her beauty and her character (1116-40).

kind of woman who inspires valour and the kind who saps it; and one of the chief differences between the two is their rank (20). As Durmart's inferior, the seneschal's wife is unworthy of his love, and hence incapable of inspiring him to deserve her by his excellence as a knight. Fenise, on the other hand, is his social equal. Indeed, the perfection of her beauty and character make her his superior, for these qualities constitute valor for a woman, and hence can be equated with nobility of birth (21).

---

(20) Possibly the author of Durmart saw Enide's relatively humble birth as a factor in Erec's recreandise. In describing the knights of the Round Table, he singles out Erec as the one who married a poor girl for love, and draws attention to the difference in rank:

C'est monsignor Erec le sage  
 Qui nez est de roial linage.  
 Il prist une povre pucele  
 Por ce qu'il le vit jone et bele,  
 Et s'est Erec mout riches hom  
 Et fiez a roi de grant renom. (8453-8)

Although approving of Erec's action, the author of Durmart was evidently very struck by the inequality of the match. This, combined with his own sense of the importance of rank, may have led him to attribute Erec's unknightly behaviour to his alliance with a woman of lower status, and this in turn may have suggested the idea of associating his own hero's perece with love for a social inferior.

(21) This is implied in the passage referred to in note 19 above, where the pilgrim concludes his description of Fenise's surpassing beauty and goodness with the verdict that she is a fine merveille and tresvaillans (lines 1116-40). See also the first dialogue of Andreas Capellanus' De Amore, where the plebeia is declared to be ennobled by her beauty and virtue (Trojel ed., pp.22-3).

Thus Fenise not only inspires Durmart to make himself worthy of her by winning glory as a knight, but she herself will also contribute to his glory if it becomes known that he has been deemed worthy of becoming her lord. Her noble status, heightened by her personal merit, encourages Durmart to make her his bride, for to do so will both demonstrate and add to his own renown as a most worthy knight (22).

Although the expression riche cuer is not used in Durmart or Blancandin, the concept seems to me to be generally a helpful one in interpreting the behaviour of the heroes of these and other works (23) who see marriage to a noble heiress as a way of gaining pris. For such heroes, a bride of exalted rank is, in the most literal sense, a status symbol. Her pre-eminent position in society corresponds to the hero's pre-eminent worth and merit,

---

(22) It should be noted that pris and valor/valoir in Durmart do not only refer to renown and merit won through fighting. The author stresses that moral qualities are as essential as martial ones:

15899	Cant haus hom est bons chevaliers Et il est trop fel et trop fiers Et trop avers et trop vilains, Certes, sa proëce en vaut mains.
15903	Uns cortois larges, bien apris, Doit estre plus tost de haut pris C'uns fel avers plus preuz de lui Qui plains est d'envie et d'ami.

See also lines 1427-56, where Durmart's father advises him to cultivate virtues such as loiaté, largece and cortoisie, and not to be faus or avers, for good qualities "le pris gardent et maintiennent" (line 1440).

(23) In L'Escoufle, Guillaume's frank interest in Aelis' inheritance can be explained partly as a function of his riche cuer, which tells him that he is destined for greatness; see lines 3402-6, in which he confidently asserts his ability, inherited from his father whose own prowess had created Guillaume's exalted status, to conquer biens, onor and terre.

or valor. By marrying such a woman, the hero achieves a social status which publicly acknowledges his moral and martial worth. Moreover, his marriage brings him a title, such as Emperor of Rome, which is known and respected far and wide. His riche cuer gives him the consciousness of his own worth, and the courageous ambition to increase and demonstrate it, which spur him on to aspire to the hand of a great princess. As Conon de Béthune puts it in his song Si Voiremant Con Cele Don Je Chante:

Or sai je bien que riens ne puet valoir  
 Tant con celi de cui j'ai tant chanté,  
 C'or ai vetü et li et sa bealté  
 Et si sai bien que tant a de valor  
 Que je doi faire et outrage et folor  
 D'amer plus halt que ne m'avroit mestier;  
 Et non por cant maint povre chevalier  
 Fait riches cuers venir a halte honor. (24)

---

(24) Les Chansons de Conon de Béthune, edited by A. Wallensköld, CEMA 24 (Paris 1921), p.3.

## Chapter 7. The Hero's Attitude to a Bride of Lower Rank.

We have seen that the heroine's high rank usually affects the hero in one of two ways; it may impress him with such a sense of her superiority that he scarcely dreams of making her his wife, or it may encourage him to seek the glory of becoming the husband of so noble a creature. In both cases, the heroine's status is important because it is at least as high as that of her lover, and usually higher than his. However, we have already noted that there are some works on which the heroine is of lower rank than the hero, and we must now look at these romances to discover the effect of such a situation on the hero's attitude to marriage.

The romances used for this study in which the heroine either is, or appears to be, lower in status than the hero, are: Floire, Erec, Eracle, Galeran, Guillaume de Dole, and La Manekine. The same situation occurs in Aucassin and in Marie de France's Fresne (1), and variants of it can be seen in Guillaume d'Angleterre (where the man concerned is not the hero) and in Joufrois (where the woman is not the heroine). Joufrois is the only work in which the woman involved is not even a member of the lesser

---

(1) Marie's Equitan also presents a high-ranking hero and a woman of inferior rank, but their affair is adulterous and not pre-marital, so that Equitan's attitude is not relevant for our study.

nobility, being simply the daughter of a borgeois.

The romance of Joufrois does not properly fall within the scope of the present thesis, since the work does not turn on the marriage of the hero and heroine. However, I should like to deal with the Joufrois episode here, for the sake of the contrast which it provides to the more usual attitude of a hero in such circumstances. The behaviour of Gratiene in Guillaume d'Angleterre forms a similar contrast with the normal attitude of the heroine, and I shall therefore examine her story in connection with the conduct of heroines.

The heroes of the other romances listed on the previous page can be divided into two groups, according to the amount of importance they attach to the problems raised by the rank of the girl they hope to marry. Fundamentally, they all believe that rank, with the wealth and lands which accompany it, is of small account when compared with the beauty and virtues of the girl they love. However, the heroes of Guillaume de Dole (2) and La Manekine do not accept this belief without some hesitation, while Floire, Erec and Galeran are not troubled by any doubts about the rightness of their scale of values. It is interesting to note that this division corresponds with the difference in

---

(2) In describing Conrad as the hero of Guillaume de Dole, I am following Ch-V. Langlois, who declared that "le véritable titre du roman, si l'on tient à effacer celui de l'auteur, serait Corras et Lienor", and that "Guillaume de Dole n'est pas le principal personnage du roman" (La Vie en France au Moyen Age d'après des Romans Mondains, Paris 1926, p.72).

status of the men concerned, so that we have here a contrast between the prudence of the reigning lord and the indifference to convention of the young prince. This contrast is borne out in Fresne and Aucassin, where Fresne's lover, who is a count, feels that he cannot marry a foundling, while Aucassin, who is only the young heir of the count of Beaucaire, is determined to marry a pagan captive.

We have already noted (above, pp.117 and 120) that Floire simply brushes aside his parents' arguments about the unsuitability of a low-ranking bride. Similarly, the young Galeran is gaily unaware of the political realities of marriage in the adult world. He talks boldly of defying his parents and the king of England in order to marry Fresne (lines 1740-8, 1827-33), but the prospect of meeting such opposition is in fact totally unreal to him. So certain is he of Fresne's fitness to be his wife, that he cannot imagine that other people will really object to his plans; when he is faced with genuine disapproval in the form of his aunt's lecture on his morals, he is absolutely confounded, and runs away without even taking leave of Fresne (2996-3036). Since he himself has never questioned Fresne's suitability as a bride, he has no arguments with which to answer the abbess; the equation of nobility of heart with nobility of birth, which comes so readily to Fresne when she herself is attacked (3868-93), has never been necessary for Galeran as a justification of his desire to marry Fresne.

He does not use any such argument in his conversations with Lohier (1649-1868) or Fresne (2115-2253), but simply affirms his intention of marrying his darling, and the strength of his love for her. Thus Galeran, like Floire, treats considerations of rank as irrelevancies. The fact that he knows Fresne, and loves her for what she is, is reason enough for him to want to marry her; he does not need to justify his decision by claiming that her goodness entitles her to be a countess, and the possibility of his parents requiring some such justification has little reality for him.

Later, when he has assumed the responsibilities of the county of Brittany, Galeran learns that marriage may involve other issues besides love, and he agrees to marry Florie partly in order to provide an heir for his lands (6321-6423). Nevertheless, this choice provides further evidence of his attitude to the importance of rank, for he prefers Florie to all the princesses mentioned by Brun. His decision is not based on statesmanlike considerations of status and dowry, but on a purely personal reason: Florie "porte le semblant m'amie" (6420). Although Brun rejoices over Florie's noble relations and the land Galeran can gain from the marriage, Galeran himself is indifferent to such advantages. He realises that he ought to provide an heir for his domains, but the idea of marrying a girl for her rank or her wealth is utterly foreign to him.



The extent to which Galeran's fundamental attitude remains unchanged can be seen from his reaction to the discovery that Fresne is in his court. Leaving the celebrations in a state of deep shock, he declares his intention of marrying Fresne and no other:

7074      Celle en qui j'ay tout mon cuer mis  
              Et que j'ay amee d'enfance  
              Vueil avoir, qui qu'en ait pesance.

Galeran does not at this stage know that Fresne is Brundoré's daughter, but he is nevertheless determined to marry her. Rank has no importance for him when compared with love; his love for Fresne makes him want to marry her, no matter what her status is, and no matter who may object. Thus Galeran's attitude is that love is the best reason for marrying, and supersedes all questions of rank or riches. He chooses Fresne for herself and not for her status, and the fact that she eventually turns out to be the granddaughter of the king of Frisia reflects the concern of the author with questions of rank, rather than that of his hero(3).

Although we are told much less about Erec's feelings before his marriage than we are about those of Floire or Galeran, it is

---

(3) Authors dealing with this type of situation are careful to avoid a genuine mésalliance; however poor the girl may be, she is always of noble blood. The exception of Joufrois, already mentioned, is more fully discussed below.

clear that he adopts the same attitude. Fascinated by Enide's beauty, knowing that "mialz asez Vaut ses savoirs que sa biautez" and that she is the daughter of a well-born and honourable man and niece of a count, he cannot resist asking for her hand. He is even less aware than Galeran of his father's possible objections; king Iac is to be presented with a fait accompli, and his son simply assumes (rightly, as it turns out) that he will be delighted by a marriage in which, far from seeing his prestige or his domains increased, he loses the income of two of his best castles to his impoverished in-laws. Nevertheless, Erec seems in other ways to be more conscious than Galeran of the problems involved in his choice of a bride of lower rank. Galeran makes no attempt to justify himself, but Erec does at least explain to Guenevere that Enide is a count's niece:

1534	... Je vos amain, Dame, ma pucele et m'amie...
1539	D'un povre vavasor est fille: Povretez mainz homes aville; Ses peres est frans et cortois, Mes d'avoir a molt petit pois;
1543	Et molt gentix dame est sa mere, Qu'ele a un gentil conte a frere. Ne por biauté ne por linage Ne quier je pas le mariage
1547	De la dameisele esposer.

Although the reading of lines 1546-7 is uncertain (4), the general

---

(4) I have quoted from the CFMA edition of Guiot's ms. All other mss. read "de la pucele refuser" for line 1547. Although, as M. Roques remarks in his notes to the CFMA edition (p.217), refuser gives a better rhyme with user in line 1546, Guiot's esposer seems to me preferable. As Roques points out: "Le 'mariage' d'Erec avec la demoiselle qu'il amène, s'il n'est pas encore célébré, doit paraître acquis et...personne ne peut imaginer qu'il soit possible à Erec d'en 'refuser' la réalisation: il ne pourrait être question que de l'expliquer" (pp.217-8).

sense of the passage is clear: Erec wants Guenevere to know that Enide's father, though poor, is frans et cortois, and that her mother is a molt gentix dame. Why Chrétien should thus report Erec's justification of his choice to Guenevere, and yet pass over any explanation he may have given to his father or to Arthur, his lord, becomes clear if we accept Guiot's version of lines 1546-7. Erec's statement that he does not seek to explain his choice fits the facts: he indeed makes no attempt to give reasons for the marriage to anyone, apart from Guenevere. Proud, self-willed, and intensely resentful of criticism, Erec is determined to ignore the views of people who might try to influence his decision. Arthur and king Iac are potential opponents; with youthful arrogance, Erec will not deign to justify himself to them. Guenevere, on the other hand, has no authority over him, and he can afford to treat her with politeness, explaining that the girl he is asking her to honour is genuinely worthy of her attention.

Thus Erec is aware that he is not making what would conventionally be called a "good" marriage. Although he rejects the idea of justifying his choice, he knows that he may have to, and, unlike Galeran, he has ready arguments to do so. Enide may not be rich, but her father is a nobleman, and her mother is the sister of a count. His bride is not his equal, but she is noble enough to give propriety to the match. Erec's trump card, however, is Enide's outstanding, unanswerable beauty. In this, and in the

beauty of character which it reflects, she is indeed his equal,  
as Chrétien stresses in a well-known passage:

1484	Molt estoient igal et per De corteisie et de biauté Et de grant debonereté. Si estoient d'une meniere,
1488	D'unes mors et d'une matiere, Que mus qui le voir volsist dire N'an poist le meillor eslire Ne le plus bel ne le plus sage.
1492	Molt estoient d'igal corage Et molt avoient ansamble.

It is to this fundamental equality that Erec unhesitatingly responds. He does not need to justify the marriage in his own eyes; the argument about Enide's parentage is useful for other people, but he himself is convinced by her beauty and virtue alone that the marriage is fitting and desirable. Thus he resembles Floire and Galeran in his indifference to the claims of rank and fortune when compared with those of a love inspired by beauty and goodness; but he differs from these other two in that he recognises the existence of other values, and is mentally prepared to face, and indeed to forestall, the criticism of others.

In contrast, the emperor Conrad and the king of Scotland not only recognise that rank and fortune are important to other people, but also attach some importance to these things themselves. They do not choose the poor but beautiful girl without first hesitating, wondering if she is really a suitable wife. The king of Scotland even considers keeping Joie as a mistress (La Manekine 1543-6),

though he swiftly rejects the idea. But the mystery of her parentage, and the still greater mystery of her mutilation, are obstacles in his mind. How can he marry a girl who may be a commoner, and who may have committed some great crime?

1547      Que ferai dont? Je la penrai.  
             Penrai? Que di ge? Non ferai!  
             Je ne sai ou ele fu nee.  
             Espoir ele a la main colpee  
             Par son mesfait...  
 1560      Si ne sa ge pas qui ele est.  
             Ele est nee, espoir, de vilains.

Thus the unhappy king reasons with himself. Ultimately, of course, he decides that Joie is too beautiful to be low-born, and too good to have been capable of a crime. Thus, faced with a more difficult decision than that confronting Floire, Erec or Galeran, the king of Scotland has to convince himself by using the arguments of which they had no need. He does not simply take it for granted that Joie's beauty and virtue make her a desirable wife, but is uncertain of how to proceed. Love has to be reinforced by rationalisation before it can lead to marriage.

The hesitation of Conrad in Guillaume de Dole springs from a different source. Llenor is not an unknown castaway, but a girl whose antecedents can easily be discovered, and Conrad's problem is to make sure that she comes of a family that is respectable enough to meet with the approbation of his vassals. Of Llenor's own qualifications to be an empress he has no doubt:

811           En la moitié a el assez  
               De sa beauté por estre dame  
               Ou d'un empire ou d'un roiaume.

But, as an emperor, he cannot simply marry the girl he wants; he must make a match which his vassals will consider suitable, and, as Guillaume points out, they are not likely to approve of Lïenor:

3036                     ...li prince et li mestre  
               Et la hautece de l'empire,  
               S'il l'oënt consoner ne dire,  
               Il le tendroient a enfance.

A more definite picture of the vassals' probable reaction is given by the insidious question of the seneschal:

3518           Prendrez vos i terre, ou avoir,  
               Ou amis? Icë i prent on.

It is in order to have some kind of answer to such criticisms that Conrad checks up on Guillaume. Only when he has satisfied himself that Lïenor's brother is trop prodom and trop haus hom de lignage does he allow his growing love to take the form of a definite proposal of marriage (2968-3019). Even then, he does not rely on the personal qualities of Lïenor and Guillaume to win his vassals' consent, but plans to trick them into agreement (3073-95). He is very much aware that Lïenor is not the bride a man in his position would normally be expected to choose, and not at all certain that his vassals will approve such an unorthodox match.

It is because he feels himself thus bound by his duty to his vassals that Conrad sees Llenor's reputed unchastity as an insuperable obstacle to his marriage. He had relied on Llenor's moral and physical perfection, combined with the reasonably noble status of her family, to compensate for her poverty:

3520      Bien prent terre et avoir li hom  
              Qui la prent bone et sage et bele  
              Et de bon lignage et pucele.

If she is less than perfect, his case falls to the ground, and he has no hope of persuading his vassals:

3690      La hautece de cest roiaume  
              Ne s'i acordast a nul fuer.

Conrad still loves Llenor, and would like to marry her in spite of her misconduct, but he dares not give way to his own desires. Unlike Erec or Galeran, he does not feel that he can simply go ahead and marry without consulting the people to whom he is responsible:

3904      Or sachiez que li emperere  
              La desirast mout a avoir,  
              Mes or ne l'ose mes vouloir,  
              Qu'il set bien que ne porroit estre.

Thus Conrad, given proof of a positive misdemeanour where the king of Scotland had only suspected a crime, does more than merely hesitate before marrying a poor girl for love: he abandons his project altogether, and does not attempt to subdue the demands of the state to his personal happiness. Although this renunciation is, of course, dictated by the development of the plot, it strikes

one as a more realistic presentation of a prince's difficulties in marrying for love than that of Erec or of Galeran, where the hero seems to have almost a free choice.

A similar emphasis on chastity is found in Eracle, where the heroine is very poor, but so pure that

2663        S'ele se tient qu'ele n'empirt,  
             Plene sera del saint Espirt.

In choosing the ideal wife for the emperor Laïs, Eracle pays more attention to chastity than to any other virtue (2197-2538), and it seems that Athanaïs' perfection in this respect is her most important quality in Laïs' eyes, for he later imprisons her in order to protect her virtue, and eventually divorces her for having taken a lover. Gautier d'Arras, however, does not give details about exactly what qualities Laïs is hoping for when he decides to marry for moral perfection rather than for wealth and status. All Gautier tells us is that Laïs

1923        ...est li plus haus hom qui soit,  
             Por ce dist et si a grant droit  
             Qu'il doit le milleur feme avoir.

Laïs' criteria can nevertheless be ascertained by looking at those of Eracle, the prophet whom Laïs commissions to choose a wife for him. As well as chastity, Eracle looks for birth and beauty; indeed, all the girls who enter the bridal contest are pre-selected for their good looks and good family. On top of these basic qualifications, the ideal wife must be preu, sage, simple, bone,



courtoise, ensignie, loial and of bon samblant. During Eracle's judgment, these qualities are all mentioned one or two times, with the exception of loyalty, which recurs five times. Chastity, however, is referred to fourteen times. The only other quality so frequently mentioned is that of beauty, which is found thirteen times. Eracle also rejects seven girls who are singled out because they harbour a particular fault : avarice, pride, ill-will (the adjective used by Gautier is felenesse), being a chatterbox, or listening too readily to gossips and flatterers (gangleors et losengiers). In two of the seven rejected girls, however, the fault is unchastity, and particular mention is made of the chastity of the other five. Thus, although Gautier recognises the need for other qualities, and even says explicitly of one candidate:

2536      El li estuet que casteé  
              A estre tel con il [Eracle] demande  
              Et con li sires li conmande,

it seems that chastity is the prime quality which Laïs seeks in his ideal wife.

Such an insistence on chastity as the virtue which, above all others, compensates for a bride's lack of lands and titles, echoes the preoccupation with the wife's chastity which G. Duby describes as one of the salient features of feudal marriage: "it was of the utmost importance that a wife receive only one seed, that of

her husband, lest intruders issued from another man's blood take their place among the claimants to the ancestral inheritance. This is why the moral code of the laity rigorously condemned adultery on the part of the woman." (5)

Thus from our study of these cases in which a hero marries a girl of lower rank, we find - as we would expect - that the girl's beauty and virtue are more important to the hero than her rank or wealth. She is chosen for her personal qualities, and not for her status, in just the same way as other heroes, whose brides are nobler than they, marry for love and not for position or dowry. However, the girl must indeed be perfect before a king will commit himself unhesitatingly to her. The king of Scotland is understandably wary of giving way to his feeling for the mutilated Joie - not because her missing hand diminishes her beauty, but because it might be the punishment meted out to her for some crime. Only when he has convinced himself that Joie is morally unblemished does he decide to make her his wife. Conrad reacts in the same way to the news of Llenor's unchastity, and feels it impossible to marry a girl who does not even have virtue to support her beauty, because the force of convention and feudal duty would be too strongly opposed to such a match.

Although all these princes marry girls whose position is lower than their own, none of them goes so far as to choose a girl who does not come of noble stock. Blanchefleur is, after all, a duke's

---

(5) Medieval Marriage (Baltimore and London 1978), p.7.

daughter, and Enide and Lienor are known to spring from at least the lesser nobility. Fresne and Joie are so beautiful that their respective lovers are certain they must be nobly born. In no case is the hero prepared to ignore the question of nobility, or to demean himself by marrying a commoner. The force of this aristocratic prejudice is seen most clearly in Marie's Fresne, where Gurun does not even consider making Fresne his bride until he has found that she is nobly born. Instead, like Conrad, he bows to political reality, and prepares to marry the well-born La Codre in order to provide legitimate heirs for his domain (6). In none of these works are the pre-conceptions of an aristocratic audience outraged, or even questioned. The readers or listeners know all along that Galeran's Fresne or Joie is noble, and can admire the hero's devotion to a nameless girl without being scandalized by a grossly unequal match.

---

(6) Gurun's separation from Codre and marriage to Fresne provides an interesting example of the working of the impediment of affinitas ex copula illicita. As a result of his physical union with Fresne, Gurun is considered to be related to Fresne's family through the bond of affinity. This relationship dirimates his marriage to Fresne's sister, which is, in a sense, incestuous. The archbishop who separates Gurun and Codre, even though they have been married per verba de praesenti, is acting in accordance with canon law, for the affinity between the pair renders their union null. As we noted in Part II above (pp.104-5), illicit affinity was often hard to prove; in the case of Gurun and Fresne, however, her position as his mistress is well and widely known, and fulfils the contemporary Papal requirement that a relationship which engenders the impediment of affinity must be publicum et notorium before the existence of the impediment can be accepted.

However, the story of Joufrois provides an example of a marriage in which the bride is definitely not of noble birth. Joufrois, disguised as a simple knight, marries the daughter of a rich burgher in order to improve his financial situation. Having spent all her dowry, he reveals that he is really the count of Poitiers; neither his bride nor his father-in-law expect such a great nobleman to keep his marriage-vows, and Joufrois does indeed leave his new wife very shortly.

Although this episode shows a prince marrying a commoner, it does not in fact question contemporary pre-conceptions about the importance of rank in marriage. Instead, the romance of Joufrois is firmly based on the belief that only a noblewoman is a suitable bride for a nobleman, and Joufrois' attitude to his marriage betrays all the contempt of the nobility for base tradespeople. Indeed, the inferior status of the girl concerned can be seen as the source of all the differences which distinguish Joufrois' attitude so markedly from that of the heroes whom we have been discussing.

The most fundamental difference is in the hero's motive for marrying. Far from making a love-match in which money is irrelevant, Joufrois marries quite frankly for money. His Blanchefleur is, admittedly, very beautiful (3408-11) and "mult par...preuz et senee" (3749), but he is not in the least in love with her. The idea of marrying does not occur to him until he finds himself so short of money that he has to take drastic steps in order to pay his debts (3387-3417). He chooses Blanchefleur because her father is rich

and she is his only heir, rather than for her beauty - although it is clear that, since he has to marry a rich burgess' daughter, Joufrois will take the most beautiful one he can find.

Joufrois' attitude to his parents-in-law is also very different from that of less mercenary heroes. Where Erec honours Licoris and his wife, and Conrad makes Guillaume his closest companion, Joufrois treats Blanchefleur's parents with gay contempt. He enjoys the satire on middle-class values which enables him to beat the canny business-man at his own game, and enjoys still more the moment when he is able to throw off all pretence of thrift, and enrage his father-in-law with a proud declaration of his allegiance to aristocratic generosity (3571-8). Seeing the burgher simply as a convenient source of income, Joufrois has absolutely no respect either for the man himself or for the prudence which has enabled him to amass his fortune.

The ultimate fruit of Blanchefleur's low status is that it gives Joufrois an excuse to repudiate her. Here again, we see how sharply Joufrois' attitude differs from that of heroes like Erec or the king of Scotland, who have no idea of separating from their wives, even when there is a serious misunderstanding between them (7).

---

(7) Erec's conjugal problems are widely known. In la Manekine, the king of Scotland is falsely led to believe that his wife has given birth to a monster; his love for her, however, is unabated (see lines 4137-4150), and he refuses to consider repudiating her. Joufrois, however, is not the only husband in this group who separates from his wife; laïs, it will be remembered, divorces Athanaïs, though on very different grounds. In his case, the reason for the divorce is not his wife's low birth, as in Joufrois, but her adultery.

Joufrois, on the contrary, has no quarrel with Blanchefleur. Indeed, he appears to be quite fond of her; yet he has not the slightest intention of keeping her as his wife once she has ceased to represent a source of funds, and the gross difference in their rank is accepted by her family as a valid reason for annulling the marriage:

3713      Quar ce pas senblant non estoit  
              Que li buens cuens qui tant valoit  
              Deignast avoir itel moillier,  
              Fille de vilain renevier.

The idea of a marriage being invalidated by a simple disparity in rank was completely inadmissible in canon law at this period (8), yet it seems that the author of Joufrois intended to present his hero's marriage as an example of just such a case. The difference in rank appears automatically to render the marriage null, so that, without any formal separation, both parties are perfectly free to contract a new union whenever they desire. Joufrois arranges for Blanchefleur to be married to another nobleman after his departure, and he himself later makes an expedient match with the daughter of a conquered enemy.

---

(8) The principle that any validly contracted marriage was indissoluble had been established by the Church since the middle of the twelfth century; Joufrois dates from the mid-thirteenth century. Differences in rank did not invalidate a marriage except in one case: if a serf married a free person without revealing that he was not free. This impediment, known as error conditionis, nullified the marriage, since it could be argued that the free partner would not have consented to the match had they known that it would entail the loss of their freedom. See Part II above, p.78, for more details on the impediment of conditio.

The inclusion of Blanchefleur's second marriage makes it clear that the author of Joufrois did not seriously believe that any marriage between a noble and a commoner was invalid. Rather, he plays with the known legal facts in order to emphasise the difference between his hero and the burgher, and in order to give a semblance of probability to Joufrois' later marriage to Amauberjon. The separation, which is an insult to Blanchefleur's father rather than to herself, shows how deeply Joufrois' attitude is affected by the fact that his bride comes of base parents.

Thus the cynical behaviour of Joufrois provides a counterpoint to the idealism of the other heroes who marry beneath them. However, there are one or two similarities which are also worth noting. Firstly, the episode in Joufrois contains a trace of the view that nobility of character makes up for deficiencies in birth, which is so important in the more usual treatment of the theme. Blanchefleur herself is shown throughout as an estimable character, and she ends up by being definitively adopted into the aristocracy. Joufrois insists that she shall be given a noble husband to replace him:

3746      Car mout me vendroit a contraire  
              Se vilans la prenoit a feme;  
              Ainz voil que soit toz jorn mais dame,  
              Quar mult par est preuz et senee.

Admittedly, this arrangement satisfies Joufrois' own vanity, which might be injured by the thought that a person once intimately

connected with him was still only a member of an inferior class. Nevertheless, it shows that Blanchefleur herself is exempted from the scorn meted out to her father; her good qualities fit her to be a true lady, and this is the status she eventually achieves (9).

The second similarity between Joufrois' approach and that of some of the more idealistic heroes shows less concern for the fate of the bride than the resemblance described above. Joufrois is very like Erec, Laïs and Conrad in his indifference to the personal feelings of the girl he intends to marry. All these men assume that their prospective brides will be only too delighted to have a well-born husband, and make no effort to discover what the girl concerned really thinks of the marriage proposed for her. Erec and Joufrois address themselves to the girl's father, and take his consent as a guarantee of his daughter's; Conrad and Laïs similarly address themselves to the girl's legal guardian rather than to her. None of them has the slightest fear that their suit will be rejected, and all are perfectly right in their assumption.

It is this certainty of being accepted which forms one of the chief differences between the heroes who marry beneath them and those who marry girls from the higher nobility. The hero who loves a girl of high rank is far from being certain that she will accept him as a husband; even if he is himself a prince, he makes his

---

(9) One notes, however, that Blanchefleur's second husband has to be bribed to marry her; he is a count whose fief has been confiscated, and king Henry not only reinstates him in his fief, but also makes him so many other gifts that he takes Blanchefleur as his wife (lines 3769-80).



proposal humbly, like Durmart, and if his rank is lower than hers he expends great energy in making himself acceptable by his prowess, like Partonopeus or Ille. Erec, Conrad, Jouflrois and Laïs, on the contrary, have no need either to be humble or to prove their worth; they are conscious of being desirable husbands by virtue of their status alone, and their worth is already sufficiently apparent to impress the lowly girls whom they intend to marry.

Another difference between these heroes and those who marry girls of high rank is that none of them is shy of mentioning the subject of marriage. That reticence which we noticed in so many cases, where the author describes his hero's feelings for the heroine at length, but does not make it clear whether he would like to marry her or not, vanishes completely in the case of the heroes who marry girls of lower rank. All the heroes we have considered in this chapter are perfectly frank and explicit about their wish to marry the heroine. This marked contrast supports our contention, expressed in Chapter 1 above (pp.136-143), that the heroine's rank is a key factor in determining the hero's attitude to marriage. We now see clearly that an apparent indifference to marriage is found only in the heroes who love girls of high rank, and is not a general characteristic of all heroes whose love leads to matrimony. Where it seemed realistic, and did not conflict with the portrayal of the hero as a disinterested lover, authors did not hesitate to depict their heroes' positive interest in marriage.

#### Part IV. Attitudes of Heroines to Marriage.

##### Chapter 1. Love Leading to Marriage.

In turning to the heroines of the romances under study, we shall find our attempt to discover their attitudes to marriage simplified by a key difference between them and the heroes. This is that the unmarried heroine is far more likely to think and speak explicitly about her future marriage than is the unmarried hero. Our heroines, with the exception of those mentioned later in this chapter, have little of the reticence on the subject of matrimony, or apparent indifference to the prospect, which made the heroes' attitudes at times hard to discover.

This feminine interest in marriage will, I imagine, surprise few people. However, it should be pointed out that the medieval heroine's concern with marriage, unlike that of her more modern counterpart, does not stem from the idea that celibacy is degrading. The shameful associations of "being left on the shelf" are unknown to her, for the usual alternative to marriage is the more honourable estate of virginity dedicated to God (1).

---

(1) As R. Metz points out in his article on "Le statut de la femme en droit canonique médiéval" (La Femme: Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin, XI, 1962, pp.95-6), the medieval church thought of women as falling into one of three categories. In order of merit, these were: (i) the virgin (ii) the widow and (iii) the married woman. However, the difficulty of maintaining one's chastity in secular life was thought to be very great, and those who chose virginity rather than marriage tended to enter a convent and take a formal vow of chastity.

Indeed, the cloister may well be preferable to an unwelcome marriage (2). The only occasion on which such a heroine may find it humiliating to be unmarried is when she is in the rare position of a jilted bride (3); so long as she is spared such a public rejection, even the heroine who has to wait a long time for her man does not find her single state dishonourable.

For the majority, however, the possibility of spinsterhood simply does not exist (4). Such heroines know that they will sooner or later be assigned a husband, whether they want one or not, and the idea of dying an old maid is completely irrelevant to their situation. As heiresses, they are girls whose marriage is the subject of political and financial speculation; they represent lands and wealth which cannot be allowed to remain in the uncertain governance of a woman. Marriage is their inevitable lot, and celibacy an unreal prospect.

- (2) The heroine of Ille et Galeron and the hero's sister in Meriadeuc both consider taking the veil in order to avoid undesirable husbands, and Lydaine in Clariss et Laris thinks of becoming a nun if she loses Claris. Galeron does, indeed, eventually enter a convent, like Guildeluec in Eliduc, but not in order to avoid an unwanted marriage.
- (3) The only heroine who finds herself publicly jilted is Ganor in Ille et Galeron; but the same fate also falls on some minor characters, such as Florie in Galeran de Bretagne and the emperor's daughter in Guy de Warewic. Ganor's rejection by Ille is, of course, only temporary, as is the rejection of Llenor in Guillaume de Dole.
- (4) Apart from those mentioned in note 2 above, who think of becoming nuns, there are three heroines who set out to live a single life in the secular world: Aelis, Fresne and La Manekine. In each of these cases, the heroine has either abandoned, or been abandoned by, the male relatives who would normally arrange her marriage, and therefore has a freedom of choice denied to most other marriageable girls.

Thus, if a heroine's thoughts turn on marriage, it is not because she is afraid of being husbandless. Rather, she fears that the marriage arranged for her may not accord with her own inclinations. Certain that she will marry, she is uncertain of her own freedom of choice in the matter, for the social position which destines her to take a husband also deprives her to a large extent of the power to decide who that husband will be. The domains she inherits must not only be controlled by a man, but by the right man for the job; and his fitness to govern is not decided by her, but by men who may well neglect to consult her on the matter at all, since she is not qualified to choose an able ruler (5). The majority of heroines therefore find themselves in the unenviable position of Melior in Partonopeus, whose sister tells her:

6770      Li vostre vos donront mari.  
             Il choisiront, vos amerois;  
             A lor chois vos amors donrois.  
             Cil doit choisir ki doit amer:  
 6774      Issi detist li plais aler;  
             Hors de cest plait vos estes mise.

In these conditions, it is not surprising that a heroine should appear to be much concerned about her future marriage. Her anxiety springs from the knowledge that her husband will not be chosen by her, but by other people, and that the choice will not be made on the grounds of compatibility, but will be influenced

---

(5) Although the Church insisted in theory on the importance of consent, this vital element was all too often overlooked in practice. Indeed, as we noted in the section of Vis in Part II above, the Popes themselves were guilty of forcing heiresses who held land from the papacy to marry for feudal and political reasons (above, pp.91-2).

instead by political considerations. She does not, as a rule, fear that the man she loves may not want to marry her (6), for she is only too well aware that her lands and wealth make her a bride whose hand few men would reject. Thus her position is in many ways the opposite of that of an Anne Elliott or a Jane Eyre (7).

Before embarking on a more detailed analysis, I would like to make a further point about the attitude of heroines in general. This is that, although most heroines - as we have seen - have good reason to be concerned about their future marriage, such concern does not usually arise until after the heroine has fallen in love (8). In other words, those features of the heroine's situation which seem most likely to keep her marriage in the forefront of her thoughts - the certainty that she will be married,

(6) The most notable exceptions to this rule are *Fresne* and *La Manekine*, neither of whom has wealth or position to offer the men they love. The other heroines who marry above their station - *Enide*, *Lienor* and the *Athanaïs* of *Eracle* - do not suffer the same doubts, either because they are not in love anyway, or because the marriage is arranged before they have time to think about their situation.

(7) In thus seeking to draw a comparison between medieval and modern literature, it is interesting to note that, after the middle ages, the French novel has sometimes tended to find the plight of the married woman more interesting than that of the unmarried girl, creating such heroines as the *Princess de Clèves*, *Mme Renal*, *Mme Bovary* and *Thérèse Desqueyroux*. However, where a young girl does occupy the centre of the stage, her position is still sometimes that of the medieval heroine, though with a modern twist. Thus *Eugénie Grandet* is an heiress who has little choice in the matter of a husband, and who falls in love with a poor young man; but the outcome of her story is very different from that of *Blonde of Oxford* or *Melior of Byzantium*.

(8) Again, the heroines who marry above them provide an exception: *Lienor of Dole* is much concerned about her chances of making a brilliant match, although she is not in love with the man she hopes to marry.

the uncertainty of her choice in the matter, and the knowledge that those who do choose her husband will not pay much attention to his personal qualities, - do not, in fact, disturb her as much as one would expect. Her situation is not, in itself, a source of anxiety; it is only the advent of love which awakens her to the difficulties of her position. Before falling in love, she apparently finds her powerlessness over her own future perfectly acceptable, and does not think of worrying about whether her married life will be happy or not; not until love has altered her point of view does she start to think anxiously about her future marriage.

There are, of course, several possible explanations for the heroine's apparent complacency. In the first place, the authors of romances were often men, and men imbued with the prejudices of feudal society: it probably did not occur to them that there was anything inherently distressing in the way marriages were arranged for the heiresses they describe (9). For such authors, the heroine's position only appears difficult when her own desires run counter to the plans made for her; it is the author, rather than his character, who needs the catalyst of love to precipitate his

---

(9) It should, however, be noted that Marie de France also neglects the feelings of girls about the way in which their marriages are arranged. Nevertheless, Marie does show herself much concerned with the results of such arrangements, and sympathises with the fate of the mal-mariée; moreover, in the lay of Yonec we find the heroine looking back in some bitterness at the way she was disposed of:

81      Malġeit seient mi parent  
          Et li autre communalment  
          Ki a cest gelus me donerent  
          Et a sun cors me marġerent!

The theme of the mal-mariée in Old French lyric poetry is, unfortunately, outside the scope of this thesis.

awareness of the problems faced by the heroine.

Secondly, it is possible that the romances reflect reality, and that medieval girls were less conscious than we should be of the harshness of their lot. There is some evidence that this is indeed the case; for example in the main version (Hilka's Hauptversion) of Athis et Prophlias, the dutiful side of Gñite's nature, personified by Sans, considers that the marriage arranged by her family has every chance of being happy and prosperous:

3815      Li rois de Bile t'a requise;  
             Pieç'a que tu li es promise.  
             Maint jor t'a ja li rois amee,  
             Et tes pere t'i a donee...  
 3837      Franche dame es de haute gent,  
             Segnor avras a ton talant.  
             Dame seras de granz afeires,  
             Et jusqu'au terme n'a mes gueires. (10)

---

(10) Another example of a woman's acceptance of an arranged marriage with equanimity is found in one of the jeux-partis (A. Langfors, A. Jeanroy, Recueil Général des Jeux-Partis Français (SATF, Paris 1926), no. CXXXIX). Here, the Dame de Gosnai, given the choice between a marriage arranged by her family and choosing her own husband against her family's wishes, prefers the first option, which spares her from any censure and is as likely to lead to a happy marriage as her own self-willed choice:

35      Et je croi tant mes privez  
             Qu'a leur pooir m'iert donnez  
             Autieux ou mieudres maris  
             Que se je l'eüsse pris,  
 39      S'aim bien ce que m'ont greé,  
             Et s'ai grant blasme eschivé.

The dame de Gosnai's partner, a man, maintains that her preferred marriage is a sin against Amours, but advances no other arguments against it.

Thirdly, most romances in fact open only shortly before the onset of love in the heroine's heart; there is therefore little opportunity for the author to describe her state of mind before love had opened her eyes. Not only was there little opportunity, but also little incentive; as we noted in our discussion of the hero, Old French <sup>romance</sup> authors were far more interested in the feelings of lovers than of people untouched by love, and, in the case of the heroine who has not yet fallen in love, the author is usually more concerned with the way she succumbs to Amor than with anything she may feel about a hypothetical marriage.

Whatever the reason behind the heroine's original lack of concern for the problems of her future marriage, there is one point which is quite clear, and which I should like to emphasise: love usually brings the idea of marriage into her mind. Like the hero, she thinks that love and marriage go together; and for her, the two are so closely linked that the first stirrings of love are often enough to set her wondering about weddings, and hoping anxiously that the wishes of her father or vassals can be reconciled with her own.

A few examples, taken from romances written at different periods, will illustrate the closeness of this link between love and marriage in the minds of many heroines.

The view that love should lead to marriage is very clearly expressed by one of the heroines of the earliest extant octosyllabic



romance, the Roman de Thèbes (11). Antigone is strongly attracted to Parthonopiex as soon as she sets eyes on him:

4129      Anthigoné, quant el le vit,  
             Forment en son cuer le couvit.

The attraction is mutual, and Parthonopiex loses no time in asking Antigone for her love: "Prie lui mout qu'el soit s'amie" (4162). Antigone, however, is shocked by such a hasty declaration, and her reply shows that she has no intention of yielding to the emotion Parthonopiex inspires in her, unless she is certain that their love will be sanctioned by a properly-arranged marriage:

4163      Par Dieu, ce respont la pucele,  
             Ceste amour seroit trop isnele!  
             Pucele sui, fille de roi,  
             Legierement amor ne doi...  
4171      Ne vous connois n'onc ne vous vi,  
             Ne mes ore que vous voi ci.  
             Se or vos doing d'amer parole,  
             Bien me pouez tenir pour fole.  
4175      Pour ce ne di, celer nel quier,  
             Ne vos eüsse forment chier  
             S'estiez de si haut linage  
             Que vous fussiez de mon parage,  
4179      Et ce fust chose destinee  
             Qu'a fame vous fusse donnee...(12)  
4183      Parlez ent, fet ele, a ma mere,  
             Et par le conseil de mon frere,  
             Qui voz parens connoist et vos,  
             Soit acordez le plet de nous.

---

(11) In his edition of the Roman de Thèbes (CFMA vols 94 & 96, 1966-8), pp. XXVI - XXX, G. Raynaud de Lage supports the traditional view that Thèbes was written in the middle of the twelfth century. It may be contemporary with Wace's Brut (1155), but it preceded Eneas, Troie and the Roman de Rou. Miss P. Grout reached the same conclusion in her article on "The Trial of Daire and the Dating of the Roman de Thèbes", French Studies XIX (1965), pp. 392-5. All our quotations are from the CFMA edition, unless otherwise indicated.

(12) Three of the five mss. of Thèbes insert here Parthonopiex' reply, in which he answers her question about his rank by asserting that he is a "reis de grant poeir" (see the SATF edition, lines 3941-4). This intervention makes Antigone's subsequent insistence on following the correct procedure all the more striking, for she now has no reason to doubt Parthonopiex' suitability.

This passage contains several interesting points, such as the insistence on equality of rank, and the mention of the rôles to be played by Antigone's mother and brother in arranging her marriage (13). However, the question with which we are concerned here is that of the link between love and marriage, and it is obvious that, for Antigone, love which does not lead to marriage is unthinkable. Admittedly, Antigone does imply that her attitude is not altogether spontaneous, but is governed in part by the fact that she is a king's daughter, and must consider what is due to her rank:

4165      Pucele sui, fille de roi,  
              Legierement amer ne doi.  
              Ne doi amer par legerie  
              Dont l'em puisse dire folie;  
 4169      Ainsi doit on prier berchieres  
              Ou ces autres fames legieres. (14)

However, it must also be pointed out that Antigone is one of the very few heroines of Old French romance who will not allow herself to yield to her love for a young man until after he has formally applied to her family for her hand in marriage (15). It is, in

(13) Antigone's father, Edipus, is of course no longer available to arrange his daughter's marriage, having imprisoned himself in a fosse, as well as blinding himself, on learning of his parricide and incest.

(14) A similar attitude is found in Andreas Capellanus who, in his chapter on the love of peasants, says that it is pointless to spend time asking girls of this class formally for their favours. Peasant girls should be taken by force, after a minimum of preliminary discourse. (De Amore, ed. Trojel, p.236). The fames legieres referred to by Antigone are presumably loose women who do not insist on many preliminaries before yielding; in La Violette, line 1199, the expression is used to describe prostitutes.

(15) The only other example which I have found of a heroine who thus makes love dependent on marriage is Yde, in Sone de Nansay. Yde loves Sone, but will not allow herself to show him any affection, because she knows that they can never marry.

fact, this rigid adherence to the proper forms which is imposed on Antigone by her position as a king's daughter; her underlying belief that love should lead to marriage is not a mere question of propriety, but a basic conviction.

The romans d'antiquité provide many more examples of heroines who, as P. Jonin puts it, "pensent au mariage à travers l'amour." (16). The only notable exception is Benoit de Sainte-Maure's Briseida (17); for the rest, "elles recherchent avec sagesse et fermeté une condition qui donnera à leurs sentiments les prolongements sociaux qu'elles en attendent." (18).

Jonin contrasts the dutiful heroines of the romans d'antiquité with the passionate and amoral Iseut. However, the contrast between Iseut and the other heroines who came after those of the romans d'antiquité is no less striking, for the majority of them followed the example of Antigone rather than that of Briseida. Thus Gautier d'Arras' Galeron cannot think of Ille without her mind immediately jumping to the idea of marriage:

(16) P. Jonin, Les Personnages Féminins dans les Romans Français de Tristan au XIIe Siècle (Aix-en-Provence 1958), p.146. Such heroines are Ysmene, Jocasta, Dido, Lavinia, Medea, Polixena and even Helen of Troy.

(17) Le Roman de Troie, ed. L. Constans (SATF; Paris 1904-1912), lines 13261-865, 14286-352, 15001-186, and 20202-340. It should be pointed out, however, that Briseida is in some ways one of the most significant heroines of the romans d'antiquité, for she is one of the few whose history appears to have been invented almost entirely by the Old French author.

(18) P. Jonin, op. cit., p.146. See also p.145, where Jonin gives detailed examples of how the heroine in the romans d'antiquité, when in love, longs for the "consécration officielle et sociale qui fasse d'elle une épouse légitime."

- 1385 Amors me fait a celui tendre  
 Qui d'amor n'ose a moi entendre.  
 A grant souffraite me deduis  
 De la cose que j'avoir puis.  
 1389 La cose que je plus desir  
 Puis bien avoir, si m'en consir.  
 Mais qu'en diroit li fix mon pere  
 Se je disoie: "Biax dous frere!  
 1393 Car me donés Ille a mari"?

(Quoted from Foerster's  
 edition. These lines are  
 omitted from ms.W).

The connexion between love and marriage here is all the more marked for being implicit. In lines 1385-1390, Galeron appears to be thinking of the impossibility of revealing her feelings to Ille, and thus initiating a love-affair between herself and this inferior whom she could "have"; but in line 1391, we suddenly find that it is in fact the idea of asking her brother to marry her to Ille which occupies her mind.

In a work written about a century after Ille, Philippe de Remi's La Manekine, we find the heroine associating love exclusively with marriage, and rejecting any other love-relationship:

- 1694 S'au roi plaist qu'il me face feste...  
 1698 Quide je pour c'estre s'amie?...  
 1704 Quide je pour chou qu'il se donte  
 A chou qu'il aint une esgaree  
 Et qui a une main colpee?  
 Enne me souvient il et membre  
 1708 Que je colpai por chou mon membre  
 Que roïne ne deüssesse estre?  
 Dont pens je ce qui ne poet estre;  
 Que je ne serai ja sa femme,  
 1712 Et j'ameroie miex en flame  
 Ardoir que fuisse sa soignant.

Joie's thoughts up to and including the start of this passage have centred on love: her love for the king of Scotland, and the

unlikelihood of his ever loving her (1683-1706). The idea of becoming queen is introduced with apparent suddenness into this love-monologue, in a way which shows how closely the ideas of love and marriage are linked in Joie's mind. She has no need to make some such explanatory transition as "Even if he does love me, he may not want to marry me", for the impossibility of love has already implied ~~the impossibility of love has already implied~~ the impossibility of marriage. The line "Dont pens je ce qui ne poet estre" (1710) shows us clearly that the idea of marriage has been at the back of Joie's mind throughout her soliloquy on love, and has now been brought to the fore by the reminder of her mutilation. It is because love, for her, presupposes marriage, that Joie can go straight from the thought of love to the consequence of getting married (becoming queen), without needing to make any explicit reference to marriage itself until the end of her monologue.

Thus both Galeron and Joie "pensent au mariage à travers l'amour". Love and marriage are associated in the same way for many of the heroines whose stories were told during the hundred years which separate Ille from La Manekine. Both the main female characters in Le Bel Inconnu fall in love with the hero, and both propose to him within minutes of their first meeting (lines 2259-76, 3381-3400). When Galiene finds herself falling in love with Fergus, her mind immediately turns to the thought of the marriage arranged for her by her father:

Ceste amor entroblierai.  
 Je n'en ruis mais oïr parler.  
 Mes pere me veut marier  
 A un roi, qui riches hom est  
 Et plus biel, espoir, que cis n'est.

(Fergus p.50, lines 27-32).

The heroine of Gliglois, when at last she admits her love for the hero, accompanies her avowal with the message that "Ja n'avra autre seignour" (lines 1710-33). Florete, having exchanged two words with Floriant and watched him once in battle, is ready to exclaim on his second appearance:

3928 Com cist chevaliers par est prous!  
 Si m'aïst Dieus, se je ne l'ai,  
 Ja mes autre mari n'arai.  
 Dex! Comment li ferai savoir  
 3932 Que je l'aim de tot mon pooir?

These examples illustrate the sort of bond which links love with marriage in many a heroine's mind. For all those whom we have mentioned, the experience of love almost immediately conjures up the thought of marriage. With those like Jofe and Galeron, the idea that love should lead to marriage is so deep-rooted that they scarcely need to formulate it. Antigone, on the other hand, makes her position abundantly clear, and insists on a formal betrothal at the very outset of her love affair. She in turn differs from those who, like Blonde Esmeree or Biauté, content themselves with simply telling the men they love that they want to marry them. All of them, however, share the assumption that love must seek its fulfilment in matrimony.

Although I have mentioned only a small proportion of the heroines of romances chosen for this study, it must not be thought that these are untypical. The great majority of our heroines make it quite clear that, for them, love and marriage are intimately associated. Other examples are Andrivete in Escanor (4427-82), Clarmondine in Cleomadès (3533-7), La Fiere in Ipomedon (1556-7), Gêite in Athis et Prophilias (3181-90) and Savinne in the same work (20609-38), Medea in Protheselaus (3838-9), Melior in Guillaume de Palerne (2680-6), and Odee in Sone de Nansay (7719-7838). In all these cases, the heroine's assumption that love should lead to marriage is clearly expressed, either in the first person or in a comment from the author (19).

However, not all our heroines are as articulate about their views on marriage as these. Although many more heroines than heroes are prepared to tell us from the outset that marriage is their goal, there is nevertheless a small number of romances where the author, by concentrating on love itself, leaves us at first in doubt about his heroine's attitude to marriage (20).

---

(19) One notes a similarly explicit association of love and marriage in the words of Marie's Guilliadun (Eliduc 510-517).

(20) Apart from those mentioned in the following pages, the only works under consideration where it is not made explicitly clear that the heroine associates love and marriage are Blancandin, Clariss et Laris, Eracle, Meraugis, La Violette and Yder. Yder, of course, lacks the opening love-scenes, where such an explicit declaration might well have been found. In the other works, with the exception of Eracle, the situation and the comments of third parties make it clear that the heroine does indeed believe love should lead to marriage, even though she does not explicitly say so. In Blancandin, for example, this belief is expressed by the heroine's duenna and by the provost, and evidently motivates Orgueilleuse's jealousy of the provost's daughters, whom she suspects of wanting to marry Blancandin (1461-1584, 1729-38).

One might expect that, in such cases, the heroine's attitude would be the exact parallel of that of those numerous heroes who, as we saw in Part III, Chapter 1, similarly find love more interesting than marriage, and leave us in doubt about their ultimate intentions. Thus, it would be satisfying to be able to show that, just as the hero's ostensible indifference to marriage springs partly from the fact that the girl he loves is nobler and richer than he, so those heroines who appear to neglect marriage are precisely the ones who love men of higher rank than themselves. Unfortunately, no such neat parallel can be found. The heroines who marry above their station are not a homogenous group. They react in different ways to their situation; Enide and Blanchefleur scarcely have a chance to express an opinion, while Fresne, Jofe and Liënor, in their various ways, are all frankly interested in marriage (21). None of them can be seen as the exact counterpart of heroes like Partonopeus or Florimont. On the other hand, the heroines who do neglect marriage are often of higher rank than the men they love, or at least of equal status. Thus their indifference to marriage cannot be seen, as in the case of the hero, as the result of an understandable diffidence, nor as an attempt on the part of the author to make his chief protagonists appear suitably unconcerned with material gain.

Neither is the opposite supposition the case; the heroines who neglect marriage do not do so out of pride. Any haughty reluctance

---

(21) Particular attention is paid to these heroines in Chapter 4 below.



to unite themselves with an inferior has already been overcome by the power of love, which enables the heroine to esteem her lover for his intrinsic merit, and not for his noble birth.

Thus one is brought to the conclusion that the heroines who pay little attention to marriage do so probably because they were created by authors who themselves found marriage uninteresting, and therefore did not bother to give their characters any views on the subject. In this respect, such heroines are indeed the counterpart of the majority of heroes, for, as we have seen, the preference for romantic love over conjugal affection was very strong in writers of romances, and contributed largely to their heroes' tendency to concentrate on love at the expense of marriage.

Those heroes and heroines who appear to find marriage an uninteresting topic also resemble each other in another way. Not only does their indifference to marriage spring from the same fundamental cause; it also has the same effect, which is to disguise the fact that such heroes and heroines do indeed see marriage as the goal of love. As we saw in examining the heroes, it can never be assumed that those lovers who do not mention marriage do not in fact want to get married. This may be the case (22), but it is not necessarily so. A few examples will show that the same thing is true of those heroines who, in the excitement of a

---

(22) Briseida, for example, does not appear to be interested in marrying either Troilus or Diomedes; she simply takes them as lovers. Some of the unmarried girls who play minor parts in Arthurian romance apparently have a similar attitude; Ydain, for instance, is happy to be Gawain's mistress until she finds a more attractive man (Le Vengeance Raguidel 3568-4867).

first love, pay scant attention to the prospect of a future marriage.

One of the best-known heroines of this type is Chrétien's Soredamors. Although it would be misleading to class Chrétien as a writer for whom marriage had little interest when compared with romantic love, it is nevertheless true that "Chrétien s'attache dans Cligès à la peinture des sentiments, et surtout à celle de l'amour naissant" (23). Thus we find, in his treatment of Soredamors' feelings, that same interest in the detailed exposition of an aspect of love which so often tends to eclipse any interest in marriage in the romances we are considering. Neither of Soredamors' love-monologues (468-515 and 888-1038) contains any mention of marriage. The first monologue, and lines 888-937 of the second, show Soredamors still struggling against the unfamiliar passion which has invaded her life, and attempting, as Mme Lot-Borodine acutely observed, to preserve that virginal "paix intérieure" which the advent of love threatens to demolish (24). At this stage, then, she has not yielded to love, and so it is scarcely surprising that she does not yet think of marriage. However, her struggle ends in a willing submission: "Or vuel amer, or sui a mestre"(938) (25).

(23) J. Frappier, Le Roman Breton: Chrétien de Troyes, Cligès (Centre de Documentation Universitaire, Paris 1951), p.27.

(24) M. Lot-Borodine, La Femme et L'Amour au XII<sup>me</sup> Siècle (Paris 1909), pp.80-81 and note 1, p.81. In the monologues of Romadanaple in Florimont and Gaite in Athis et Prophilius, this hesitation is dramatised as a debate between Amors and Sapience. The influence of Eneas can be seen in both Cligès and Florimont in this respect.

(25) Frappier rightly draws attention to this line, which forms "le pivot du monologue" and brings out the importance of free-will in the theory of love adopted by Chrétien. (Op. cit., pp.69-70).

From this point onwards, she is the eager pupil of love, but neither the lessons she learns (to be charming to all for the sake of one, how to interpret her name, never to change her affections: 941-83) nor the question she asks (should she reveal her feelings to Alexander himself ? 984-1009) have anything to do with marriage. She is much too interested in exploring her strange new emotions, and above all in debating whether to declare herself to Alexander, to give a thought to the possibility that she might marry him. The only other passage in which Chrétien gives Soredamors' thoughts in detail is that in which she hesitates over what name to use in addressing Alexander (1369-98); here, obviously, there is little room for any mention of marriage, and it is hardly surprising that the subject does not arise.

When he is not using direct speech, Chrétien's comments on Soredamors' feelings similarly ignore the question of marriage. He gives brief analyses of her conflicting emotions, sometimes intermingled with metaphorical accounts of her combat with Love (438-55, 516-27, 880-87, 1591-3, 2200-10), and pays particular attention to the physical manifestations of her various states of mind (456-65, 868-87, 1569-77, 2084-96). However, in thus illuminating his heroine's feelings, Chrétien concentrates on her reaction to such immediate situations as the first onslaught of love or the news of Alexander's apparent death; he does not show her speculating about the future. Unlike Galeron in similar circumstances, Soredamors does not wonder whether she dare ask her

brother to marry her to Alexander; ignoring such practical steps, she sees Gawain only as someone who must not be allowed to discover her present feelings (458-61). Thus the idea of marriage does not seem to present itself to her, and her feelings, whether presented directly or indirectly, are not those of a girl for whom love immediately inspires thoughts of matrimony.

However, there are two points at which Chrétien does in fact refer to Soredamors' attitude to marriage. Both are occasions on which her feelings are described indirectly, instead of being given in the first person by Soredamors herself, and this method of presentation seems to underline the insignificance of marriage in her thoughts. Yet in both cases, it is clear that the idea of becoming Alexander's wife is one which fills Soredamors with delight, and that she could look for no better outcome of her love than to be joined with her sweetheart in holy matrimony.

The first hint we are given of Soredamors' real feelings about marriage occurs during the passage in which Chrétien explains that Alexander does not ask Arthur for her hand because he is uncertain of her feelings towards him (2180-97). Chrétien points out the irony of the situation by telling us, for the first time, that Soredamors would in fact be overjoyed if she knew that Alexander wanted to marry her; but he, poor fellow

2191      Tant crient que il ne despletüst  
             Celi qui grant joie en eüst,  
             Que molt mialz se vialt il doloir  
             Que il l'eüst sor son voloir.

(My italics).

Chrétien's second reference to Soredamors' attitude to marriage is rather fuller - not surprisingly, since it occurs at the point where she is actually accepting Alexander's proposal. When she at last hears Alexander declare that he is wholly hers, Soredamors' emotion is so great that she experiences a physical shock (26):

2292     A cest mot cele tressailli,  
           Qui cest presant pas ne refuse.  
           Le voloir de son cuer ancuse,  
           Et par parole, et par sanblant,  
 2296     Car a lui s'otroie en tranblant,  
           Si que ja n'en metra defors  
           Ne volanté, ne cuer, ne cors,  
           Que tote ne soit anterine  
 2300     A la volanté la reine,  
           Et trestot son pleisir n'an face.

While Chrétien's first mention of Soredamors' attitude to marriage simply told us that she would have been very happy if Alexander had asked for her hand, this second passage shows clearly how deep are her feelings on the subject. Even though she timidly hides her delight under the semblance of obedience to the queen, it is clear that Soredamors fully shares Guenevere's point of view, and that her submission to the queen's wish is in no way forced or half-hearted (27). Guenevere's exhortation to the young couple to

---

(26) Chrétien's use of physical observations to illuminate mental states during the first part of *Cligès* is well worth studying; it seems to go beyond the conventional notation of the symptoms of love-sickness, and plays an important part in the delineation of character.

(27) It is not unusual for a heroine to dissemble her eagerness to marry her lover by appearing to bow to the wishes of her feudal guardians. Laudine, Ydoine and Melior all adopt this pretence, and Melior even goes so far as to say that she would have preferred to marry Partonopeus' rival, but will dutifully accept her vassals' choice of Partonopeus (10491-10502).

seek the fulfilment of marriage accords with Soredamors' inmost wish (*le vouloir de son cuer*); with her whole being (*volanté, cuer* and *cors* 2298), she gives herself to Alexander in compliance with the queen's will.

Thus although Chrétien has not, up to this point, given more than a single indication that his heroine associates love with marriage, this lack of emphasis should not blind us to the fact that Soredamors does indeed see marriage as the natural goal of her love. If her thoughts do not readily turn to marriage, it may be partly because she does not know that her love is reciprocated, but mainly it is because, in creating her, Chrétien was far more interested in the unusual or unexpected aspects of first love than in the comparative banality of love stimulating a girl's concern with marriage (28). Thus Soredamors' failure to mention marriage during her earlier soliloquies certainly does not imply that she is averse to the idea, or that she would prefer the clandestine affair which Guenevere advises against. Indeed, it is most unlikely that Soredamors, whom Chrétien shows to be at once innocent, timid, and proudly conscious of her reputation, would even have contemplated an illicit union. She has no need of Guenevere's counsel to make her reject such a course, for she herself sees the honourable and lasting bond of marriage as the only satisfactory form of union for herself and the man she loves.

---

(28) As I have pointed out, nearly all the heroines of the *romans d'antiquité* expect love to end in marriage; so too does Gautier d'Arras' Galeron, the heroine of another romance which may have preceded *Cligès*. On the other hand, the careful analysis of awakening love was a territory which writers were only beginning to exploit; Chrétien himself ignored it in *Erec*.

Our examination of Soredamors' attitude has shown that, although she makes little reference to matrimony, she nevertheless sees it as the natural goal of her love. Chrétien, however, did not think her desire to marry Alexander merited special attention; he preferred to concentrate on some of the other effects of love, and only mentioned her views on marriage when the subject arose naturally, either in the course of a comment on Alexander or as the result of Guenevere's intervention. Thus Soredamors' interest in marriage is introduced casually, as something the audience will naturally expect, rather than as a curiosity to be pointed out. Chrétien neglected to tell us his heroine's views on marriage at the outset because such information was unnecessary; the mere fact that Soredamors was in love was enough to allow his readers to deduce that she wanted to become Alexander's wife.

If we turn to look at Amadas et Ydoine, we shall find a more striking example of a heroine whose views on marriage are felt to be not only uninteresting, but unnecessary. The author of Amadas makes his heroine speak and think only of love in the early stages of her association with Amadas; yet we later find that, in speaking of love, Ydoine has in fact been referring to marriage. Thus although she seems to ignore marriage, Ydoine, like Soredamors, regards it as the only fitting outcome of her love; and the linking of the two ideas is to her so automatic that she has no need to make her thoughts explicit.

Ydoine further resembles Soredamors in that she too is at first "desdaigneuse d'amors" (29). However, once she feels the first pangs of love, she yields wholeheartedly (1088 ff.); there is none of that struggle against a growing passion which is such a feature of Soredamors' "conversion". Neither has Ydoine any cause to fear that her love is not returned, for Amadas has given plenty of evidence of his passion for her. Thus two of the features which may account in part for Soredamors' apparent lack of interest in marriage are missing in Ydoine's case; yet she too appears to have no thought of marriage as the eventual outcome of her new-born love.

When love enters her heart, Ydoine's immediate reaction is to reproach herself bitterly for her previous hardness, and to resolve to do penance for her cruelty (1116-1148). This love-monologue, which contains no reference to marriage, is followed by an analysis of the way in which her kiss revives Amadas; the author then gives us Ydoine's declaration of love, and concludes with an exchange of rings between the lovers (1213-96). The couple then part, to be reunited only after Ydoine has been married for a year to the count of Nevers.

---

(29) J. R. Reinhard, in his book Amadas et Ydoine: an Historial Study (Durham, North Carolina, 1927), p.41, declares that Ydoine's pride is directly modelled on that of Soredamors. In view of the many other similarities between Amadas and Cligès, some of which are pointed out by Reinhard on pp.28-9 of his book, it seems extremely likely that the author of Amadas did indeed know Cligès, and may well have used Soredamors as his model at this point. We have already referred to the similarities between Cligès and Amadas in Part III, Chapter 2, pp.167-8.



Although this scene is the only opportunity before the lovers' separation for Ydoine to tell Amadas that she would like to marry him, it contains no explicit mention of marriage. There are, however, plenty of cues which could lead naturally to the subject; for instance, Ydoine four times promises to love Amadas for evermore (1138-9, 1253-8, 1262-5, 1285-92). Yet even when such a promise is accompanied by an exchange of rings, it does not provoke any reference to betrothal or to a future wedding. On giving her ring to Amadas, Ydoine simply says:

1264        Par cest anel d'or vous saisis  
              De m'amour tous jors loiaument. (30)

She then kisses Amadas, takes his engraved ring, and puts it on her own finger with the words:

1287        Cestui voel tenir de par vous,  
              Et si sachiés, tout a estrous,  
              Ja mais de moi ne partira  
              Tant com nostre amistés durra:  
 1291        Ce ert en loiauté toudis  
              S'en vous ne remaint, dos amis.

Thus Ydoine gives her own ring as a pledge of lifelong love, and promises to keep Amadas' ring as a sign of lifelong fidelity, conditional only on his fidelity to her. She does not say that she associates lifelong love and fidelity with marriage, nor that her promise is anything more than a lovers' pact.

---

(30) This scene may be compared with that in L'Atre Perilleux, lines 3086-3133, where a girl gives Espinogre a ring as a token of her love, and then sends him off, as Ydoine does in Amadas, to become a famous knight and to practise courtly virtues in order to deserve her. This girl does not seem to envisage becoming Espinogre's wife, and there is certainly no question of marriage in the mind of Espinogre himself.

Neither does her exhortation to Amadas to make himself worthy of her love (1224-61) contain any open suggestion that his merits will entitle him to ask for her hand. The only remark which could be interpreted as implying that Ydoine sees marriage as the goal of Amadas' love-service is the conclusion of her exhortation:

1259        Si soiés tex, biaux dous amis,  
              Si vaillans et de si haut pris,  
              Que saue i soit l'amours de moi. (My italics).

Though the expression underlined has of course wider connotations, it is in fact often used in connexion with marriage in Old French. For example, Partonopeus' mother chooses as a bride for her son a girl so noble, beautiful and talented that "Mes fix i seroit saus molt bien" (3963-8). In Gliglois, Biauté's sister tells Gliglois that Biauté has chosen him as her husband, and warns him: "Sy gardés qu'ele saue i soit" (1945). Yvain, rejecting a proffered bride, softens the blow by describing the girl as one:

Ou l'anperere d'Alemaigne  
Seroit bien saus, s'il l'avoit prise.

(ed. Reid 5482-3; ed. Roques  
    5476-77).

Reid translates saus here as "well-provided for". Foerster translates the expression estre bien saus a as "sich gut stehen bei" (31). Neither rendering makes the link with marriage explicit, yet it would seem, from the examples given above, that such a link did

---

(31) Wörterbuch zu Kristian von Troyes, 5th edition (Tübingen 1973), p.230. TL gives these lines from Yvain as an example of sauf in the sense "gut versorgt".

indeed exist. Moreover, Ydoine herself uses the expression estre sauf in an unequivocally marital context later in the poem. Speaking of her plan to choose a suitable husband for herself, she says:

7466      Jel prendrai tel, je vous creant,  
               Qu'en lui serai sauve si bien,  
               Ja ne m'en blasmerés de rien  
               Que je ne soie bien dounee.

Later, referring to Amadas as her future husband, she tells her father's vassals that Amadas

7682      D'autre part ra si grant bonté,  
               Si grant valeur et si grant pris  
               Et si grant tere, ce m'est vis,  
               Que je serai bien sauve en lui,  
 7686      Et ricement dounee sui.

Thus the expression "Que sauve i soit l'amours de moi", used by Ydoine when exchanging rings with Amadas, may possibly have brought the idea of marriage to the minds of medieval readers.

However, such an interpretation is far from certain. Ydoine's expression is remarkably similar to a line in Partonopeus which has no reference whatever to marriage; a bishop, exhorting Partonopeus not to misuse God's gifts, says:

4393      Del sien li faites tel honor  
               Qu'il ait en vos save s'amor.

Moreover, the examples of estre sauf and avoir sauf given in TL

occur in many other contexts beside that of matrimony (32). Clearly, it would be rash to interpret Ydoine's remark as a definite reference to marriage.

Thus the birth of Ydoine's love for Amadas does not, as far as can be ascertained, inspire any thoughts of marriage in her heart. In this she can be contrasted with other proud damsels such as Clarie (Cristal et Clarie 8067-76) and Blonde, both of whom mention marriage almost as soon as they have yielded their affection. Ydoine, on the other hand, gives no definite sign that she thinks of Amadas as anything more than a lover. Like Soredamors, she thinks and speaks only of love, and appears to ignore marriage altogether.

However, Ydoine's silence on the subject of marriage is extremely misleading. As the story progresses, it becomes clear that she does indeed want to marry Amadas. Her rejection of the count of Nevers (2340-2462), and her attempt to make sure that he

2313                   ...mais ne la pregne  
Et qu'Amadas l'ait sans calenge

are the first open signs that she had hoped to become the wife of Amadas. Later, she insists that Amadas should not do anything to

---

(32) TL does not give separate listings for estre sauf and avoir sauf, but examples of these expressions can be found under the glosses "heil, wohlbehalten..." (col.202), "gut versorgt" (col.204) and "wohl angebracht, lohnend" (col.205). The latter two meanings of sauf are illustrated by examples where marriage is clearly meant (col.204, lines 46-52; col.205, lines 2-3, 8-9, 13-20), as well as by non-marital uses.

compromise their eventual marriage, and even refuses to run away with him when a perfect opportunity arises, because she is determined to marry him with the consent of her family and "par esgart de crestienté" (6731-64).

More significantly still, we learn that, in her eyes, the exchange of rings between her and Amadas was not simply a lovers' pledge, but a valid betrothal ceremony capable of being used in an ecclesiastical court to annul her marriage with the count:

3715	Et nonpourquant raisnavlement Quide aciever tot son talent D'Amadas et de son signour, Qu'ele ne doit dou Creatour
3719	Ne de la gent mal gré avoir. En igou a mult bon espoir Que outre son gré fu dounee Au conte et a force espousee,
3723	<u>Si avoit Amadas plevi</u> <u>Qu'il la prendroit et ele li.</u> (My italics).

The familiarity with canon law which Ydoine displays here is extremely interesting, and will be discussed in Chapter 2 below. For the time being, however, we are concerned with the light this disclosure throws on Ydoine's earlier attitude to marriage. As we saw, Ydoine in fact made no mention of marriage in her promise to Amadas, but spoke only of love. Her pledge, as the author has recorded it, is not a promise to marry Amadas, but to love him. Her words do not bear any resemblance to the betrothal formula recorded in Jostice et Plet: "S'il i a consentement de futur, qui dient issi: Je te prendroi à feme; et je toi a seignor, et jurent

que issi le feront" (33). Even this specific pledge is not regarded in Jostice et Plet as grounds for the annulment of a subsequent marriage by one of the contracting parties; yet this is precisely the significance attached by Ydoine to her promise to Amadas. Admittedly, Jostice et Plet is a work of the latter half of the 13th century, and may record a formula which had not come into use at the time Amadas was written. However, the twelfth-century Arsenal ms. of Partonopeus describes a betrothal ceremony at which a specific and well-known formula is employed; a couple are betrothed:

Od les paroles devisees  
Qui sont a cel mestier ussees

(Gildea ed., Appendix I,  
lines 1513-4).

Thus a formula of some kind was in use at the period of the composition of Amadas. The prescribed words may have resembled those of Jostice et Plet, making a specific promise of marriage; or they may have come nearer to the phrase used by Ydoine:

1264      Par cest anel d'or vous saisis  
            De m'amour tous jors loiaument.

If Ydoine is in fact using a recognised betrothal formula, we can

---

(33) Li Livres de Jostice et de Plet, ed. P. N. Rapetti (Paris 1850), book X, cap. 1, § 31. Some examples of betrothal formulae are also found in E. Martène, De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus, 2nd edition (Antwerp 1736), vol.II, col.372 (Ordo IX), col.376 (Ordo XI) and cols 378-9 (Ordo XII). These, however, are unlikely to be contemporary with Amadas, since as J. -B. Molin points out in Le Rituel du Mariage en France du XIIe au XVIe siècle (Paris 1974), p.51, the earliest known betrothal liturgy dates from the second half of the thirteenth century. The formulae recorded by Martène are all similar to that found by J. -B. Molin and P. Mutebe in a late-fourteenth century ritual from the diocese of Sens: "Je te fiance que je te penrai a femme et a espouse/a mari et a seigneur/dedans xl jours, se sainte Eglise acorde." (Le Rituel du Mariage, p.306).

see how it is that she is able to pledge herself to become Amadas' wife without making any explicit mention of marriage. Her use of the verb saisir, which is employed in the passage from Partonopeus referred to above, and the introduction of a kiss into the passage describing her promise (34), support the idea that her words are indeed a form of betrothal. Moreover, the way in which the idea that her promise constitutes a canonical impediment is introduced suggests that the author expected his audience to be aware of the legal significance of Ydoine's pledge. He does not have to point out that her words were a valid betrothal; he simply says that she was betrothed, and assumes that his readers will understand that he is referring to the scene of the exchange of rings.

Thus it is indeed unnecessary for Ydoine to say in so many words that she wants to marry Amadas. The words she does use, and which appear to refer only to love, are in themselves a promise of marriage. In the case of Soredamors, we saw that Chrétien did not need to make her matrimonial hopes explicit because they were clearly

---

(34) According to J. -B. Molin and P. Mutembe (op. cit. p.198), "le baiser était une particularité du rite des fiançailles." They give several examples of a kiss forming part of the Church ritual of betrothal in the sixteenth century (op. cit. pp.51-2). Nearer to the date of Amadas, we find a kiss forming an important part of the betrothal ceremony described in the twelfth-century Arsenal ms. of Partonopeus (ed. Gildea, Appendix I, line 1519). The kiss also became part of the wedding ceremony. According to E. Chénon, "Recherches Historiques Sur Quelques Rites Nuptiaux", Revue Historique de Droit Français et Etranger 36 (1912), pp.587-96, the kiss was a Roman custom as a result of which the fiancée achieved some of the status of a wife; the custom was enlarged into a legal formality by Germanic tribes, and eventually found its way into some marriage liturgies from the eleventh and twelfth centuries on. At the same time, it still survived as a feature of betrothal ceremonies, and was a ratification of the act of betrothal, as a result of which the betrothed acquired rights to the gifts exchanged between the couple, even if one partner died before the marriage itself was solemnized.

implied by her love, and could therefore be taken for granted. With Ydoine, we see how this association of love and marriage had such a firm hold on the medieval mind that "love" could be used to mean "marriage" in a legal formula. Even if Ydoine's promise was not in fact the one normally used in a formal betrothal, the fact remains that the author of Amadas thought it a likely formula, and expected his audience to understand the full implication of this apparent "lovers' pledge".

We have spent some time on Soredamors and Ydoine, in order to show that, although they do not mention marriage, they are nevertheless bent on it. In the majority of the other romances studied here, as we have seen, the heroine's interest in marriage is quite explicit. Indeed, the only heroines whose matrimonial hopes are genuinely hard to discover at an early stage, apart from Soredamors and Ydoine, are Blancheflor, Fenice, Lidaine and Marine in Claris et Laris, Lidoine in Meraugis, and Euriant in La Violette (35). We thus find that, in 29 of our 35 romances, it is quite clear that marriage is the goal of love as far as the heroine is concerned, and that this is often evident from an early point in the story. This contrasts with the apparent indifference to marriage of those numerous heroes whose matrimonial hopes are not made explicit. The explicit interest in marriage on the heroine's part serves to indicate that love in these romances is indeed marriage-oriented, despite the author's silence on

---

(35) Of the other heroines mentioned on p.307 above and in note 20 of this chapter, Enide and Athanaïs are placed in situations where marriage arrives almost before they have time to know whether they are in love or not. The matrimonial hopes of L'Orgueilleuse d'Amor, though not explicit, can easily be detected in the early stages of her relationship with Blancandin; no statement can be made about Guenloie in Yder, since the opening section of that work is lost.



the topic where the hero is concerned. The contrast between heroes and heroines in this respect also supports our view that special factors, notably the fortune to be won through marriage, gave rise to the hero's apparent indifference to the prospect. Since authors are not reluctant to mention marriage in the case of the heroine, it would seem that we were justified in looking for the special circumstances which made them reluctant to do so in the case of the hero.

## Chapter 2. The Heroine's Attitude to Love Without Marriage.

As in the case of the heroes, we shall consider under this heading both pre-marital and extra-marital (i.e. adulterous) relationships. We have seen that most of the heroines of the romances we are considering do not simply content themselves with a vague hope that, one day, they may be able to marry the men they love. For many of them, the idea of marriage is almost an integral part of their concept of love; they are incapable of falling in love without their minds immediately turning to the thought of marriage, and they make this perfectly clear by their thoughts and, sometimes, by their deeds (1). Even those heroines who at first sight do not seem to have marriage in mind are often just as determined on it as their more explicit sisters, and their determination, too, may date from the very first hour of their love.

However, the conventions of the marital romances allowed few heroines the joy of an immediate fulfilment of their desire to get married. Authors illustrate the constancy of their lovers by introducing certain obstacles, whether imposed by other characters or set up by the couple themselves, which usually postpone any

---

(1) A certain proportion of heroines take direct action by proposing to the men they love. This phenomenon is often the fruit of the social superiority of heroines, as in Le Bel Inconnu, Florimont, Gliglois, and La Violette (Aigline de Vergis episode).

possibility of a wedding for some time, and perhaps for several years (2). In these circumstances, the hero's conduct is often determined in some measure by that of the heroine; in particular it is she who, in many cases, decides what the nature of the relations between herself and her lover shall be during the period of delay. She may forbid, permit, or even actively encourage her sweetheart to consummate their love before their marriage, and he, as a rule, will follow her lead. As we noted above, in Part III, Chapter 7, the bride's chastity is an important consideration when she is of lower rank than her husband, and the following pages will show that it is also a question which affects some of the most high-born damsels in our romances.

However, before examining the stand taken by various heroines on the question of pre-marital chastity, it is worth pointing out that not all heroines are called on to make a choice in the matter. In about half of the texts used for this study, the hero and heroine are either kept apart from the time they declare their

---

(2) As S. Barrow points out on pp.8-9 of The Medieval Society Romances (New York 1924), one of the aims of romance-writers was to demonstrate "the safe-conduct of love beset by hostile forces." To this end, they generally included a stage of "Ordeal" in their plots between the stages of "Betrothal" and "Union". In this stage, "the great lessons of fine amor in courtesy, morality, and loyalty are always learned through suffering...Human frailty or malice, cruel destiny, or the tyranny of social convention intervenes to give love a chance to prove through travail and sorrow its strength to punish, to hold, and to overcome. Not until the hero and the heroine have stood the test of many hardships, will fine amor make good the promise of betrothal." (Ibid., pp. 17-18).

love to each other until shortly before their wedding, or else scarcely have time to realise that the love they had thought one-sided is, in fact, mutual, before their wedding is arranged. Couples who are separated until shortly before their wedding are Eneas and Lavinia; Ille and Ganor; Ipomedon and La Fiere; Protheselaus and Medea; Durmart and Fenise; Fergus and Galiene; Blancandin and l'Orgueilleuse d'Amour; Yder and Guenloie in the extant portion of Yder - though it seems that they may have been together for some time in the lost early section of the romance; Kay and Andrivete (Escanor); Laris and Marine (Claris et Laris); Guy and Felice (Guy de Warewic). Couples who are not both in love, or do not know that they are both in love, until shortly before their wedding, are Ille and Galerou; Erec and Enide; Alexandre and Soredamors; Yvain and Laudine; Guinglain and Blonde Esmeree; Laïs and Athanaïs (Eracle); Conrad and Liénor; Gliglois and Biauté; Sone de Nansay and Odee. In these circumstances, the heroine usually has no opportunity either to initiate or to discourage any attempt at love-making, and the views on the matter of pre-marital chastity which the author might have given her can only be guessed at from the general picture of her character (3).

---

(3) Galiene and Odee, both of whom attempt unsuccessfully to seduce the men they love before the "Ordeal" phase during which the couple is separated, are exceptions here.

As a rule, such romances also leave us in the dark about the author's own views on the question, though it may sometimes be possible to infer them from the degree to which it appears that he has manipulated the plot in order to avoid any occasion for an illicit sexual affair (4).

Among the heroines who have to decide whether or not to keep their virginity until their wedding-day, there are of course two camps, and we shall have to deal separately with those who say yes and those who say no. Since the romances in which the heroine decides to preserve her chastity are sometimes more explicit about her motives than are those in which she takes the opposite course, we shall turn to them first, and use them as a guide to the arguments involved. We shall then be in a better position to distinguish the attitudes which underlie the actions taken by heroines from the other camp.

i. Romances in which the heroine is chaste.

Two romances in which the case for virginity is most strongly argued are Galeran de Bretagne and Jehan et Blonde. In Galeran, all the characters who mention the subject adopt the same point of view, which seems to be that of the author. Renaut evidently

---

(4) See, for example, Fergus, where Guillaume le Clerc preserves the couple's chastity, despite Galiene's flattering attempts to seduce Fergus, by making the hero sternly indifferent to her advances, and then separating the couple. The same device is used in Sone de Nansay. In Ipomedon, on the other hand, the author, Hue de Rotelande, seems to have a very different attitude; although he keeps his protagonists rigidly chaste, his ironic comments on their wedding-night suggest that he found the whole topic somewhat absurd (Ipomedon 10499-10516).

believed very strongly that it was a shame and a disgrace for a girl to lose her virginity before marriage, and that the shame was all the greater if she became pregnant (5).

This view is first expressed by Lohier, who, suspecting that his god-daughter has taken a lover, accuses her of having disregarded all the virtuous principles he has tried to inculcate into her (1427-43), and of being on the road to ruin:

1446      Mal ait femme qui s'asetüre; (6)  
             Car mot ne scet quant elle chiet,  
             Et apres ce qu'il lui meschiet,  
             Que la sainture amont li lieve,  
 1450      Se repent elle, et si lui grieve  
             Quant elle a a mal entendu:  
             Quant en a le cheval perdu  
             A tart va l'en fermer l'estable.

He thinks that Fresne is already meffaicte (1426), (TL "der sich vergangen hat, schuldig"), and fears that she will be totally disgraced:

1465      Et ay paour de mal greigneur  
             Que ne vous tole voustre hounour.

---

(5) The contention that the "Renaus" of Galeran is not the same man as Jean Renart, which has been widely accepted since the appearance of Rita Lejeune's L'Oeuvre de Jean Renart (Liège 1935) and E. Hoepffner's article "Renart ou Renaut?" (Romania LXII (1936) pp.196-231), rests in part on the difference between the attitudes of the two authors to this very question of pre-marital chastity. See R. Lejeune, op.cit. pp.338-40 and notes, and E. Hoepffner, art.cit. pp.223-4.

(6) Soi asseürer, not given in Foulet's glossary to his edition of Galeran (CFMA 37), is translated by TL as "sich verlassen auf" and "ruhen, ruhig bleiben, säumen". The meaning here, however, seems closer to that given by Godefroy, "Être persuadé, avoir la certitude, la confiance" (vol.8, p.202). Lohier is presumably thinking of women who become over-confident, either in their own ability to get out of trouble or in the good intentions of the man concerned, and thus forget about the possible consequences of their actions.

The "mal greigneur" is, evidently, Lohier's suspicion that Fresne is pregnant, to which he has already referred in line 1449, quoted above. A few lines later, he makes another reference to this shameful possibility; when Fresne declares that her pallor is caused by a physical malady, he retorts:

1526        Non avez voir, ce m'est avis;  
              Ains vient d'Amours vostre mesaise.

This accusation, however, is more ambivalent than that in line 1449, and could simply refer to Lohier's more correct diagnosis of the cause of Fresne's pallor as love, and possibly unsatisfied desire:

1458        Le cuer n'a mie ce qu'il veult,  
              Ce me tesmoigne vo couleurs.

Thus Lohier is certain Fresne is in love, and is afraid she may already have been seduced and may be, or may become, pregnant. Such misconduct is seen by Lohier as sin (1427-34) and dishonour (1466).

Fresne, for her part, is quite clear about Lohier's accusation:

1498        Dictes, sire, que suis ensainte,  
              Si com j'entens a vostre dit.

She also sees the conduct Lohier imputes to her as base and shameful, using terms such as villanie (1485, 1505), folie (1489) and honte (1496). However, she is innocent of all such disgrace:

1545 Et sachez qu'onques n'y mespris,  
 Par quoy j'aye perdu mon pris;  
 N'a Dieu ne plaise qu'il adviengne  
 Que vous ne le secle me tiengne  
 1549 A femme par honte blasmee:  
 Tel ayme autrui et est amee,  
 Qui pour amour n'a roy n'a conte  
 Ne tourneroit son corps a honte.

Thus both Fresne and Lohier take the view that it is extremely shameful for an unmarried girl to engage in a sexual relationship, and that it would be more disgraceful still if the seduction were made public by a pregnancy. (Fresne is extremely indignant about this insinuation of Lohier's, as can be seen in lines 1500-1502).

When we turn to Galeran, we find that he considers that Fresne would be deceived or cheated (the verb used is baisier) by anything more than the most chaste advances on his part:

1823 Maistres, oncques ne l'adesay  
 Ne une foiz ne la besay,  
 Ne neouldroie avoir baisee  
 Pour qu'el se tenist a baisee.

The fifteenth-century scribe here rhymes baisee "kissed" with baisiee "deceived"; the author presumably wrote baisiee "kissed" and boisiee "deceived". Renaut links the same two words when he gives us his own view of the matter, which corresponds with that of his characters to a large extent:



- 2254 Depuis ne s'est Fresne tenue  
Vers li, mais son deduit requiert  
De tout quanque a honneur affiert.  
S'en est moult Galeren a aise,  
2258 Qui doucement l'acole et baise,  
Et celle li moult volentiers.  
Leur amour est vray et entiers,  
Qui de plus ne veulent baisier  
2262 Fors d'acoller et de baisier:  
De ce voir ne baisent il mie.  
Se li amant baise s'amie,  
S'il l'acole ou parolle a li,  
2266 N'en devez celle ne celi  
Blasmer ne tenir a vieutance.

Although Renaut is here defending a certain amount of love-making, it is clear that he feels anything other than kissing and embracing would be dishonourable, and would expose the lovers to censure. In particular, his use of baisier/boisier here seems to extend the meaning of the verb from "deceive" or "cheat" to "do wrong". The examples of boisier in TL and Godefroy do not generally suggest such an extension of meaning, and one wonders whether Renaut intended a pun with baissier "lower", in the sense of "to demean oneself, stoop, be degraded". Certainly, the idea of moral degradation is not far from his mind in these lines.

It seems likely that the view adopted by Renaut, and expressed by his chief characters, is strongly influenced by the teachings of the Church. E. Hoepffner, who drew attention to Renaut's moralizing tendencies, also remarked on "ces réflexions religieuses qui sont un des traits les plus caractéristiques de son oeuvre." (7).

---

(7) "Les Lais de Marie de France dans Galeran de Bretagne et Guillaume de Dole", Romania LVI (1930) p.216. E. Hoepffner re-emphasised this point in his second Romania article, "Renart ou Renaut?" pp.221-2.

Maurice Wilmotte, too, was struck by the "mentalité profondément religieuse" of the characters in Galeran, and declared that "la piété de l'auteur éclate partout" (8). One of the most concrete signs of Renaut's familiarity with Church doctrine is his knowledge of canon law, to which attention has already been drawn in this study (9). The Church's view of extra-marital sexual relations, from the time of the apostles Peter and Paul, had always been that illicit sexual activity was a grave evil (10). As G. Duby puts it, "the Church saw sexuality as the principal means by which the Devil secured his hold on the creation... The only place for licit sexuality was within marriage. Beyond its confines, all sexual activity was fornication and, as such, cursed." (11). Such was this abhorrence of sexuality that, even within marriage, the sexual act was considered to be a sin, though a venial one (12). This view, with its concomitant praise of virginity as the ideal condition for a Christian, was particularly advocated by St Jerome in his polemic Adversus Jovinianum (13).

(8) Un Curieux Cas de Plagiat Littéraire: Le Poème de "Galeran", (Paris 1928), p.8 and note 1, p.8.

(9) The unhappy Galeran turns to the doctrine that "consensus facit muptias" to justify his reluctance to marry Florie; see above, pp.209-211.

(10) See the Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, vol.9, cols 1344-5, for a brief outline of the condemnation of lust by the apostles and Church fathers.

(11) Medieval Marriage : two models from twelfth-century France (Baltimore and London 1978), p.16.

(12) A thorough survey of Church opinion on the sinfulness of sexual enjoyment within marriage is given by H. A. Kelly in Love and Marriage in the Age of Chaucer (Ithaca and London 1975), pp.245-261. The authorities cited by Kelly come mainly from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

(13) For the text, see Migne, PL vol. XXIII, §§237-320. Jerome's views in the Adversus Jovinianum are summarised in DTC vol.8, cols 915-6.

The Church's distaste for sexual activity outside marriage can further be seen in the fact that some canonists came to wonder whether any woman who had been "souillée par l'adultère, ou même par la fornication" ought not to be debarred from the sacrament of marriage (14) — a view which, taken to extremes, would have led to the paradoxical conclusion that only virgins were good enough for the third-rate condition of matrimony (15). More practically, St Augustine had developed the Pauline teaching that, although man was indeed subject to unlawful sexual urges, he could direct them to lawful ends in marriage. He elaborated the influential doctrine that marriage presented three good things (bonae) which redeemed its carnality, namely : proles, fides, sacramentum (16). However, the presence of the bonae was also strongly linked to the chastity of the marriage-partners. Thus, although the Church did not in fact go so far as to forbid marriage to the very people whose fallen state made them most in need of a remedy for their concupiscence, the theological view of marriage as the "outward and visible sign" of the union of Christ and the Church led to an emphasis on the virginity of both

---

(14) A. Esmein, Le Mariage en Droit Canonique, 2nd edition (Paris 1935), vol. I, p.427.

(15) St Jerome and other fathers placed virgins at the top of the hierarchy of conditions of life; next came chaste widows and widowers, and lastly, married people.

(16) Augustine's view is summarized by E. Jombert in the entry under "Les Biens du Mariage", Dictionnaire du Droit Canonique vol.II, col.842; St Paul's ideas are expressed, for example, in I Cor. 6 vv.15-20 and 7 vv.1-9, Eph. 5 vv.22-33, and I Tim. 5 vv.11-14.

partners in the ceremony, and particularly of the bride (17).

Thus a pious man like Renaut would probably have been led to look on pre-marital sex as sinful for two reasons. In the first place, it had been condemned by St Paul and by most of the orthodox Christian fathers who elaborated Paul's teaching; and in the second place, it debased the sacramental symbolism of marriage as the image of Christ's union with His virgin bride, the Church. Interestingly enough, this second aspect does not seem to have had much effect on Renaut. He condemns pre-marital unchastity as wicked and shameful, but he does not argue that Fresne and Galeran ought to refrain from illicit sexual relations in order to preserve the sacramentality of their eventual marriage. His arguments are negative rather than positive, and indeed amount to little more than the repeated statement that such behaviour is wrong, and dishonours any girl who indulges in it. Although he evidently feels this very strongly, Renaut has no positive arguments to support his condemnation.

---

(17) See, for example, the elaboration of this Pauline doctrine in the teaching of Guillaume Durant, bishop of Mende (1230-96), who saw the third spiritual mystery of marriage, the union of Christ and the Church, as shown in "*l'homme qui n'a eu qu'une femme, et qu'une femme vierge, qui s'est ensuite fait clerc, puis a été ordonné prêtre.*" (DDC II 853) (my italics). A further instance of the emphasis on virginity can be seen in the medieval custom of holding a veil over the bridal couple during the wedding ceremony, which is thought by E. Chénon to have been a symbol of the bride's purity and of the fidelity of the married couple; see his article "*Recherches Historiques sur Quelques Rites Nuptiaux*", *Revue Historique de Droit Français et Etranger* XXXVI (1912), pp. 637 ff.

We should note, moreover, that this condemnation applies almost exclusively to the woman, and not to the man. It is Fresne who would be "par honte blasmee" (1549) if she was unchaste; it is she whom Lohier accuses of sin and guilt, she whose honour would be lost. Galeran's fault is envisaged only in two places: in the remarks Renaut makes about both lovers in lines 2261-7, quoted on p.332 above, where the poet is in fact justifying the lovers and not blaming them; and in lines 1819-22, where Lohier warns Galeran that a seduction would be unworthy of a man of his high rank:

1821        Ne doit faire a femme desroy  
              Qui filz est a conte ou a roy.

This, however, springs from a respect for caste, from the aristocratic code of "noblesse oblige", and not from the spirit of strict Christian morality by which Fresne is judged. That there should be such an imbalance in the moral codes applied to the two sexes is not, of course, surprising. We have already seen, in Part III, Chapter 2, how the illicit sexual affairs of heroes are condemned, if at all, from the point of view of the chivalric code only, and the present chapter will furnish further examples of the more rigid morality applied to heroines.

Before leaving Renaut, we must take account of a different influence on his attitude to pre-marital unchastity in Galeran: the lai of Fresne which he used as a source. In Marie's lay, the heroine's morals are far from being as strict as those Renaut approves of in his own Fresne. Not only does the Fresne of the lai

sleep with her lover before marrying him; she is installed as his mistress without any question of a marriage between them ever arising, and it seems that she is expected to remain in her lover's household even after he has married another girl. It seems very likely that Renaut's insistence on chastity in his own version of the story is in part a reaction against the loose morals which Marie records so calmly (18).

When we turn to Jehan et Blonde, we find Philippe de Remi expressing much the same attitude as Renaut. Here, however, the heroine is definitely in charge of the situation, and the author puts his views mainly in her mouth, instead of scattering them among several of his characters. Like Renaut, however, he reinforces the moral aspect by his own direct comments on his characters' behaviour.

---

(18) As far as I know, none of the scholars who have examined the relationship between Galeran and Marie's Fresne has drawn attention to this point. Both E. Hoepffner and M. Wilmotte explain the marked deviation from Fresne in this part of Galeran by the supposition that Renaut was now following a different source, of the "roman idyllique" type: see M. Wilmotte, Un Curieux Cas de Plagiat Littéraire pp.11-13, and E. Hoepffner, "Les Lais de Marie de France dans Galeran", p.220. This contrast with Marie is not mentioned by F. Lyons in her article "The Literary Originality of Galeran de Bretagne" (Vinaver Miscellany, Manchester 1965, pp.216-7), nor by R. Lejeune in L'Oeuvre de Jean Renart. In pp. 201-4 of this work, Mme Lejeune shows how Renaut's description of the behaviour of his solitary heroine constitutes "une opposition voulue, continue" to the free-and-easy life of his model, Jean Renart's Aelis; it seems to me that exactly the same motives prompted Renaut to contrast his high-principled hero and heroine with their originals in Fresne.

Blonde makes her position quite clear at the outset of her love-affair with Jehan. Having at last agreed to grant Jehan her love, she warns him that there is a condition attached:

1312      Que ja de mon cors ne jorrés  
             Fors d'acoler et de baisier.  
             De tant vous voel bien aaisier;  
             Mais n'en avrés autre avantage  
 1316      Devant que nous par mariage  
             Nous porons ensamble acorder.

Jehan accepts the restriction, though he wants to be quite sure that Blonde really will make it worth-while by marrying him in the end. His slight hesitation is understandable, since this is the first time marriage has been mentioned by either of them; Blonde, like so many heroines, simply assumes that Jehan must want to marry her, and does not wait for him to propose before settling their future in this off-hand way. We should also note that Blonde is one of the heroines who, as we remarked at the start of this chapter, takes the initiative in deciding whether or not the couple should be chaste before marriage.

Beaumanoir thoroughly approves of his heroine's stand, and makes an attempt to explain why they are wise to wait:

- 1520 De tous les jus d'amors s'aaisent  
 Fors d'un que loiatés despit;  
 Pour chou le metent en despit  
 Duskes a tant qu'en loialté  
 1524 Acompliront leur volenté.  
 Maint amant deceü en sont,  
 Qui mie tenu ne s'en sont  
 Dusk'a tant qu'il venist en point,  
 1528 S'en chiet leur amour en mal point.  
 C'a le fois en sont deceü  
 Et par grossece perceü;  
 Car ki est plains de fole haste  
 1532 A la fois son bon tans en gaste.  
 Li dui amant dont je parol  
 Ne vaurrent pas estre si fol  
 Que bien souffrir ne s'en vausissent  
 1536 Pour doute que plus n'i perdissent.

In any case, adds the practical Beaumanoir, Jehan and Blonde enjoy the embraces which they allow themselves so much

- 1543 Que del seurplus bel se confortent  
 Et en esperant se deportent.

Moreover, their patience is amply rewarded. On their wedding-night, as Beaumanoir is careful to point out, their delight is all the greater for having been delayed:

- 4811 Selonc chou que desiré eurent  
 Le ju d'amours que gardé eurent,  
 Selonc chou ont or plus de joie...  
 4846 Quant on plus desire a avoir  
 Aucune cose, et il avient  
 Que cele cose a voloir vient,  
 De tant comme ele est desiree,  
 4850 De tant est ele plus amee  
 Du couvotecour, quant il l'a.

Thus in Jehan et Blonde, as in Galeran, we find pre-marital sexual relations condemned, and the danger of an illegitimate pregnancy pointed out. However, the terms Beaumanoir uses to



condemn unchastity are rather different from those adopted by Renault. In Galeran, we find words such as honte or hontaige (1496, 1549, 1552, 1605), folie (1489, 1604), villanie or villaine (1485, 1505) and vieutance (2296), all expressing the shameful and base nature of unchastity. Fresne is thought of as meffaicte (1426) and forfaicte (1491); her suspected unchastity would deprive her of hounour (1466) and of pris (1546).

Beaumanoir, on the other hand, lays less emphasis on dishonour; he stresses the practical disadvantages of unchastity, and gives positive arguments for the preservation of virginity until the wedding-night. Of all the terms used by Renault to express the shame and immorality of sex outside marriage, only two are found in Jehan et Blonde, and both in rather different circumstances. Renault's folie (19) finds an echo in Beaumanoir's fol, but in Jehan et Blonde the word is given a strictly practical sense; the two lovers were not so foolish as to jeopardize their future happiness for the sake of a lesser but immediate pleasure (see lines 1533-6, quoted on p.339 above). Later, we find Beaumanoir using the word honi, but it does not apply directly to unchastity. Jehan reflects that, if he stays in Oxford instead of going home to his dying father, it will be obvious that he and Blonde are in love, and she will be honnie (1727-33). However, the honte will not fall on her alone, but on both of them (1736, 1882), and it

---

(19) Folie, fol and folage were commonly used in Old French of illicit love, as the examples in TL indicate (see vol.III, especially cols 1999 and 2012-4).

seems likely that Jehan is in fact thinking more of the humiliating punishment which Blonde's father will mete out if he discovers the love-affair, than of the shame of suspected unchastity.

The terms Beaumanoir does use to express his disapproval of pre-marital unchastity are not, however, devoid of all suggestion of disgrace. The key-words are loialté and despit (lines 1520-24, quoted on p.339). Despire, as used in line 1521, is glossed by Hermann Suchier, the editor of Jehan et Blonde, as "mépriser, dédaigner". Thus illicit sex is something the lovers would scorn to indulge in. Unchastity is also scorned by loiaté, used here in the sense, noted by TL, of "Redlichkeit" - honesty or uprightness. However, the sense of "legality" or "legitimacy" was also important to Beaumanoir. When he says that Jehan and Blonde want to wait

1523        Duskes a tant qu'en loialté  
             Acompliront leur volenté,

it seems that this idea of legitimacy may well have been in his mind. When he came to write the Coutumes de Beauvaisis, Beaumanoir had frequent recourse to the adjective loiaus in the sense of "legitimate"; expressions such as loiaus oirs, loiaus mariages and enfans loiaus recur throughout his analysis of the

---

(19) Folie, fol and folage were commonly used in Old French of illicit love, as the examples in TL indicate (see vol.III, especially cols 1999 and 2012-4).

laws of marriage settlements and inheritance (20), and it is possible that, at the time Jehan et Blonde was written, he was already inclined to think of marriage in terms of legality, as well as of rightness.

Whether or not one interprets en loialté as "legitimately", it is certain that we have here the sort of argument which we noticed was missing in Galeran. Renaut, in his eagerness to point out the shamefulness of pre-marital unchastity, forgot to make any mention of marriage itself, and ignored the debased sacramentality of a marriage between unchaste people. Beaumanoir, on the other hand, does not forget that pre-marital chastity is designed to preserve the uniqueness of the sexual relationship in marriage. He points out the difference between the "jus d'amors...que loiatés despit" and the fulfilment of desire "en loialté". When Jehan and Blonde are at last married, he draws attention to the fact that their previous restraint heightens their connubial bliss, and that the perfection of their joy comes from the complete freedom of legitimate love: (21)

4807      Or n'i estuet mais point de gaite;  
            En tous sens ont joie parfaite.

---

(20) See, for example, §§578, 584, 591, 595-9 of the Coutumes de Beauvaisis (2 vols, ed. A. Salmon, Paris 1899-1900).

(21) Beaumanoir's emphasis on the delight of unrestricted love reads almost like a direct answer to André's Capellanus' "Quid enim aliud est amor nisi immoderata et furtivi et latentis amplexus concupiscibiliter percipiendi ambitio?" (De Amore, ed. Trojel, p.142) - an argument which André gives to one of his personages who wants to prove that love cannot exist in marriage. Jehan and Blonde know all about the delights of furtive and hidden embraces, and they are much happier when they no longer have to hide.

The importance of restricting sexual fulfilment to the marriage-bed is further brought out by Beaumanoir's comment on the loss of Blonde's virginity; she is not in any way grieved by it, because the right moment has come:

4814        Blonde tant a Jehan s'otroie  
              Que de pucele pert le non; (22)  
              Ne l'en caut vaillant un bouton,  
              Car bien l'eut gardé dusk'au point.

This remark implies that, had Blonde given herself to Jehan before their wedding, the result would have been far from happy. Renault, on the other hand, makes no attempt to link his condemnation of illicit sex with an explanation of the rightness of sex within marriage. A comparison of the descriptions of married life in Galeran 7700 ff and in Jehan et Blonde 4785-4895, 5145-78, and 6035-6180 will show that, although both authors dwell on lasting

---

(22) Oddly enough, some 1200 lines and several nights later, we read that:

6035        Cele nuit fist Jehans de cele  
              Dame qui estoit damoisele.

It seems unlikely that this is merely a slip on Beaumanoir's part, especially as he attaches such importance to the wedding-night itself. The most likely explanation is that, since Jehan has meanwhile been made a knight and the count of Dammartin, his wife is no longer an ordinary young woman, but a noble lady. Her transformation takes place in bed because the wife took her status from that of her husband as a result of the two being "one flesh": see E. Chénon, Histoire Générale du Droit Français Public et Privé des Origines à 1815, pub. par M. Olivier-Martin, (Paris 1926-9), vol.2, p.97. As Chénon points out husband and wife kept their own status if they came from different classes; a commoner could not be ennobled by marriage, though a lesser noble could be made more noble. Instances of dame and damoisele being opposed solely in terms of rank are rare, according to the information given in Les Dénominations de La Femme (A.Grisay, G.Lavis, M.Dubois-Stasse, Liège 1969) pp.118-127 and 138. The most usual opposition between the two terms is that of "young girl/married woman". L.Foulet, however, notes a few examples of dame being used in an honorific sense, irrespective of marital status, in his Glossary of the First Continuation (The Continuations of the Old French "Perceval" of Chrétien de Troyes, ed. W. Roach (Philadelphia 1949-71), vol.III, part 2).

love and happiness, it is Beaumanoir who gives prominence to the positive side of his moral attitude to pre-marital continence.

Thus, although Beaumanoir shares Renaut's conviction that pre-marital unchastity is degrading, he expresses that conviction with a noticeably different accent. Renaut's rather over-heated array of terms expressing shame and dishonour is replaced by the calmly disdainful metre en despit; the influence of Pauline teaching is replaced by an apparent concern for legal correctness. An even greater difference between the two, however, is Beaumanoir's interest in the positive virtues of chastity, and especially in the relationship between pre-muptial continence and marriage itself. Beaumanoir's attitude is, above all, positive and practical, while Renaut's is exactly the opposite.

An illustration of this different attitude can be seen in the way the two authors approach the question of illegitimate pregnancy. In Galeran, it is presented as a severe disgrace; but in Jehan et Blonde, it is also a practical handicap. Many love-affairs, says Beaumanoir, are found out because the girl gets pregnant (1530). Jehan and Blonde must at all costs avoid being found out, because Blonde's father might possibly have Jehan put to death if he knew that he had presumed to pay court to his daughter (1728-32), and would certainly make life very difficult for the lovers (1555-6). Thus the possibility of pregnancy is to be avoided because it will lead to the love-affair being discovered and probably forbidden, together with any chance of an eventual marriage. Obviously this argument is used by Beaumanoir

as a general reflection on the inadvisability of unchastity, and does not apply specifically to his hero and heroine, who in any case scorn such behaviour; but the consequences of discovery in the case of Jehan and Blonde can be used to show why Beaumanoir describes the exposure of the lovers as one of the disadvantages of an illegitimate pregnancy. A similarly practical note is struck by Marie de France in Fresne, where Gurun advises the heroine to come and live with him because her "aunt" would be furious if she became pregnant while staying at the convent (Fresne 280-4). Such practical considerations are completely missing from Galeran, where illegitimate pregnancy is seen from the moralist's point of view, as a cause for belated repentance (1448-53) and a disgrace which a well-brought-up girl cannot bear to have imputed to her (1470-1502). Moreover, Beaumanoir's argument is more positive than that of Renaut as well as more practical, for he shows that the avoidance of discovery through pregnancy has a definite purpose; it improves the lovers' chances of being able to marry when a suitable occasion arises. Renaut, on the other hand, simply condemns unchastity and its consequences, without showing any of the positive benefits of restraint.

A final difference between the two authors is that we find little trace in Beaumanoir of the one-sided condemnation of unchastity in the woman alone which we noticed in Renaut. Both

Jehan and Blonde, we are told, gladly abstain from an illicit sexual affair with its dangers of discovery and illegitimate pregnancy (1305-18); both will be shamed or punished (honni) if Blonde's father finds out that they love each other (1728-36, 1881-2); both share in the bliss of the wedding-night which is the fruit of their mutual continence (4803-57) (23). Although it is Blonde who originally insists on pre-marital chastity, she is in no way singled out as the one who will be shamed and degraded by immoral behaviour.

It is, perhaps, possible to relate this difference to the difference in status between Blonde and Fresne. Fresne, the foundling who is loved by a young lord, might well have reminded a medieval audience of the kind of girls who, as Duby puts it, "were enjoyed by men of great family along the way" (24). These girls were often, it seems, "the family's bastard daughters, who formed a kind of pleasure reserve within the house itself." (25) Although the "house" in Fresne's case is a convent, the similarity between the two situations might well have been strong enough to lead Renaut to insist particularly heavily on the purity of his heroine.

---

(23) Similarly, in La Manekine, we find that both the hero and the heroine independently reject unchastity; see lines 1543-6 and 1712-3.  
 (24) G. Duby, Medieval Marriage (Baltimore and London, 1978), p.92.  
 (25) G. Duby, loc. cit.

Thus we find that the attitude of Beaumanoir to pre-marital chastity is both firm and rational. He does not condemn without reason; and the reasons he gives show a definite concern for the achievement and maintenance of a happy and lawful wedded life. It is tempting to attribute this interest in marriage itself to the fact that Beaumanoir is one of the few writers of romances whom we know to have been a married man (26).

Nevertheless, it must not be thought that Beaumanoir was the only author to present pre-marital chastity as a means of preserving the special relationship between husband and wife. In Amadas et Ydoine, an apparently similar argument is used by the heroine to dampen her lover's ardour. However, as we shall see, Ydoine's argument is not a general plea for the sanctity of marriage, but rests rather on the need to adopt a strict code in the particular circumstances in which she is placed.

Having rescued Ydoine from the cemetery where she had been buried, Amadas, as we noted in Part III, Chapter 2, realises that at last the two of them are free to lead their own life (6639-67), and feels inclined to make a new beginning on the spot:

6673      Ce li feïst mult volentiers  
             Dont a eü tant desiriers,  
             Que bien i voit et tans et lieu (on the tombstone!)

---

(26) H. Suchier, Oeuvres Poétiques de Philippe de Remi, Sire de Beaumanoir, (SATF, Paris 1884-5), vol.I, p.xiii. It is also possible that Gautier d'Arras was a married man, although the identification given by Cowper in the introduction to his edition of Ille et Galeron (SATF, Paris 1956) was hotly contested by A. Fourrier in Le Courant Réaliste (Paris, 1960), pp.179-183.



Ydoine, however, "icestui gieu/Ne li otroie ne consent" (6676-7):

6726	Icel desir devés targier Tant quel puissiés sans pecié faire Et a grant joie et a cief traire Que nus n'i puisse vilounie
6730	Noter, ne mal, ne felonnie...
6751	Et s'ore le me fasiés, Bien savés que fait ariés Si grant pechiet et si cruel Et si orible et si mortel
6755	Que puis ne porriés ja mais, Selonc crestienté, après Nule baillie avoir de moi D'espouser fors encontre loy
6759	Et en avoutire jesir. Pour ce vous en vient mix sofrir Un poi de terme, pour avoir A joie plus vostre voloir.

J. R. Reinhard, in his commentary on Amadas, sees this insistence as yet another example of the heroine's "fierce pudicity", from which her husband has already suffered. He is also pleased to discover that Ydoine has absorbed some of the teaching of the Church: "Ydoine will under no circumstances yield Amadas her body till she shall have been divorced from the Count, for she does not wish to proceed otherwise than in accordance with Christian law." (27). Leaving aside for the moment the question of Ydoine's personal morality, let us look more closely at her acquaintance with Christian law. Reinhard's comment is not very illuminating; divorce, with freedom to remarry, did not exist in Church law in the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries any more than it does today, and Reinhard in any case does not say which particular aspect of Christian law he

---

(27) The Old French Romance of Amadas et Ydoine: An historical study (Durham, North Carolina, 1927), p.30 and p.159.

is thinking of. However, it seems most likely that he interprets Ydoine's words to mean that she does not want to commit adultery, and that she knows adultery is considered sinful by the Church. This is certainly a reasonable interpretation of lines 6726-30, where Ydoine says that it would be a sin for her to yield to Amadas before they are married, and that people would see their behaviour as base and wicked. However, lines 6751-9 introduce a new idea. Ydoine does not simply think that it would be sinful to sleep with Amadas while she is legally married to the count; she declares in perfectly clear terms that such an action would result in her being unable to become Amadas' lawful wife even after her marriage to the count has been annulled. In other words, if she commits adultery she will not merely be proceeding "otherwise than in accordance with Christian law"; she will in fact be unable to proceed at all.

In order to clarify this situation, let us look at the procedure which Ydoine actually envisages. During the scene in the cemetery she only gives the outline of her plan:

6744	Si quic, voiant tot mon barnage, Ouvrer ensi qu'a grant hounor Me partirai de mon signour, Et que serai vostre espousee
6748	Et de tous mes amis donee Sans pecié a l'ouneur de Dé Par esgart de crestienté.

However, in an earlier passage she has explained her projects in detail, and the reader of the romance will remember that she:

3720      En içou a mult bon espoir  
             Que outre son gré fu dounee  
             Au conte et a force espousee,  
             Si avoit Amadas plevi  
 3734      Qu'il la prendroit et ele li.

This passage, to which we have already referred in discussing Ydoine's betrothal, shows the precise grounds on which she hopes to have her marriage annulled. In the first place, she did not agree to the marriage, but was forced into it. In an age which saw the victory of the principle that free and spontaneous consent was the essential element of the marriage-contract, this amounted to declaring that the marriage had never existed: as the Livres de Jostice et de Plet, commenting on a decision of Pope Alexander III (1159-81), expressed it: "Là où est force n'est pas mariage" (28). Ydoine's second plea is that she was already betrothed to Amadas at the time of her marriage to the count - in other words, that she had already given a valid consent to a different marriage "par paroles de futur". Although the existence of a previous consensus de futuro did not at this period nullify a subsequent consensus de praesenti, it provided an important supporting argument in cases where, as in that of Ydoine, the validity of the subsequent consent was called in question (29). Thus Ydoine's case is a very good one, and she

---

(28) Li Livres de Jostice et de Plet, ed. Rapetti (Paris 1850), book X, ch.i., §13.

(29) In the middle of the twelfth century, some sixty or seventy years before the date of Amadas, Popes had regularly nullified a second union in cases where a previous desponsatio had been made; see pp.65-6 above. Later, the existence of betrothal vows came to constitute a prohibitive impediment to a subsequent marriage with a third party. Although this imposed strong pressure on the betrothed couple to marry each other, it was not an insuperable barrier to their marrying other people; a dispensation could liberate them from their betrothal vows, and those who married in spite of the existence of a prohibitive impediment would be validly married, though they would have to do penance.

has every reason to believe that she will be able to have her marriage annulled honourably, without creating any scandal or earning the ill-will of her vassals, her family or the Church.

However, the nullification of her marriage to the count is only the first stage of Ydoine's plan. Her ultimate object is to marry Amadas, and to do so in a way which will ensure that her reputation is untarnished, and that no disapproval from any quarter will blight the happiness of her married life:

3708      La contesse vait au mostier  
             Prier a Diu que aciever  
             Puist son desir et son penser,  
             Sans reparlance de folie,  
 3712      Sans pecié et sans volonnie,  
             Si que de gent ne soit blasmee,  
             Que mult crient estre deparlee.  
             Et nonpourquant raisnavlement  
 3716      Quide aciever tot son talent  
             D'Amadas et de son signour,  
             Qu'ele ne doit dou Creatour  
             Ne de la gent mal gré avoir.

Explaining her project to Amadas, she again emphasises her determination to make an honourable marriage, with the participation of all her vassals (6744), the consent of all her relations (6748), in accordance with the law of the Church, and without any sin in the eyes of God (6749-50). This is her ideal, and she will accept no compromises. Amadas' idea of running away and living with her

6651      En ces diverses regions  
             Qu'en ne sace qui nous soions

is totally unacceptable, for she would know in her heart that he was not her lawful husband, and her dream of their honourable life together as duke and duchess of Burgundy would come to nothing (6731 ff). Thus Ydoine has a very high ideal of the sort of marriage

she wants, in which conjugal bliss is combined with material prosperity and the esteem of both Church and people; the nullification of her marriage to the count is only the first step in bringing this ideal to the realisation on which her mind is set.

Now, it should be noted that Ydoine's case in seeking her annulment does not in any way rest on the question of whether or not she has slept with Amadas. Her arguments about the forced marriage and the previous betrothal are valid in themselves, independently of the question of whether or not she has had sexual relations with either Amadas or the count; she does not even need to bring up the fact that her marriage to the count is unconsummated (30). Why, then, should she believe that her plans will be utterly fruitless if she gives herself adulterously to Amadas? Not, indeed, because adultery would invalidate her plea for annulment; but because it would render impossible the second stage of her plan, her marriage to Amadas. Her concept of the result of such an action is perfectly clear: if Amadas possesses her now, there will never be any possibility of a lawful Christian marriage between them, and they will have to live in sin for the

---

(30) Non-consummation did not, in itself, nullify a marriage, since the matrimonial bond was formed by consent alone, and not by the copula. The marriage of Joseph and the Virgin Mary was held to be perfect, though unconsummated, as we have pointed out on p.74 above. However, the non-consummation in Ydoine's case might be considered to be due to impotence, caused in part by a magic spell, which would indeed nullify the union. This point is discussed more fully in Chapter 3 below.

rest of their lives. Ydoine, in fact, believes that her adultery with Amadas would constitute a diriment impediment to their marriage; it would set up a relationship between them which would automatically nullify any marriage-contract into which they tried to enter.

Canonically, Ydoine, is probably wrong in this belief. Since her marriage to the count does not in fact exist because she did not consent to it, she is not committing adultery by sleeping with another man, and there can therefore be no question of any such impediment. However, if Ydoine had in fact been legally married to the count, her adultery with Amadas might indeed have had the consequences she envisages. During his long pontificate (1159-81), Alexander III did a great deal to organise and clarify the doctrine of marriage, and among other things he examined the impediment of crimen. Fundamentally, this impediment was designed to nullify any attempt by an adulterous couple to marry by plotting the death of their legal husband or wife. However, the impediment could also apply in another case, which "se produit quand, du vivant de la première femme, un individu en connaît une autre, et contracte avec elle un mariage de facto ou lui donne sa foi de l'épouser" (31). Thus simple adultery was not enough to constitute a diriment or nullifying impediment.

---

(31) J. Dauvillier, Le Mariage dans le Droit Classique de l'Eglise (Paris 1933), pp.158-9. See the discussion of the impediment of Crimen in Part II above, pp.82-4.

It had to be complicated by a desire to break up the existing marriage, and this desire could be seen to exist in cases where there was an attempt on the life of the legal partner, or where the adulterous couple had planned, or even realised, their own marriage. Although Amadas and Ydoine had promised to marry each other before Ydoine's wedding, and cannot therefore be accused of plighting their troth while Ydoine was married to another man, their adultery would nevertheless entail the impediment of crimen on the second ground envisaged by Alexander III: that of the de facto marriage. Indeed, Alexander III's decision bears exactly on the circumstances in which Ydoine finds herself. Since she and Amadas have already exchanged the betrothal vows per verba de futuro which initiate their marriage, any subsequent copula carnalis between them would be held to ratify their engagement and bring the marriage into de facto existence (32). Their de facto marriage, having thus been realised while Ydoine was another man's wife, could never be transformed into a marriage de iure; the impediment of crimen would henceforward render their union null in the eyes of the Church.

However, it is doubtful whether the author of Amadas was aware of the extreme subtlety of the various marriage regulations which

---

(32) In initiating sexual relations, an engaged couple were thought to demonstrate their present consent to the marriage which had been arranged for the future. This is the doctrine of the matrimonium per copula sponsalibus superveniens, or matrimonium praesumptum; see above, Part II, pp. 68-71.

might have applied had his imaginary situation arisen in real life. His view of the matter seems to be as follows: Ydoine is legally married to the count of Nevers until the sentence of annulment has been passed, and any sexual fulfilment of her love for Amadas would therefore be adulterous. The author appears to think that such adultery would, in itself, constitute a diriment impediment to Ydoine's marriage to Amadas, without the need to invoke a de facto marriage of whose possible existence he seems unaware. As we saw in discussing the marriage of adulterers (Chap.2 above, pp.194-5), it was commonly believed in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries that simple adultery dirimated the subsequent marriage of the guilty pair, and this seems to be the belief of the author of Amadas.

We have strayed a long way from our initial examination of Ydoine's attitude to chastity, but as a result we are now in a position to see exactly why she is so horrified by Amadas' suggestion, and why she describes it as a "pechiet...mortel" (6753-4). She is not simply concerned with preserving her purity, although this is, indeed, one aspect of her attitude. Neither is her chief objection the fact that adultery would be a sin in the eyes of the Church, for which she would have to do penance (33).

---

(33) The penance for adultery is discussed by A. Vacant, "L'Adultère et le lien du Mariage", Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique vol.I.i. cols. 485-6.



She is indeed concerned about the Church's view of her situation, but for a more serious reason: the Church would not merely disapprove of her misconduct, but would see it as an immovable obstacle in the path of her plan to marry Amadas (34). Denied the sacramentality of lawful marriage, she and Amadas would have to spend their lives in the shadow of eternal damnation - a very different future from the one Ydoine dreams of:

6736           ...ains en irons  
               A grant joie en nostre contree,  
               Bourgoigne, qui tant est grans et lee  
               Et bele et gent et deliteuse  
 6740           Et de tous biens plenteuse,  
               Comment que soit, en pais ne guerre;  
               Je sui hoirs de toute la terre,  
               Ne m'en puet nus faire tolage.  
 6744           Si quic, voiant tot mon barnage,  
               Ouvrer ensi qu'a grant hounor  
               Me partirai de mon signour,  
               Et que serai vostre espousee  
 6748           Et de tous mes amis donee  
               Sans pecié a l'ouneur de Dé  
               Par esgart de crestienté.

---

(34) There was, of course, no such thing as a civil marriage at this period. The only alternative to a Church wedding was a clandestine marriage in which the couple simply exchanged the marriage-vows in private, without any witnesses or officiating clergy. Such marriages, when contracted between people who were legally free to marry each other, were regarded by the Church as valid, if undesirable. However, the existence of a diriment impediment would nullify a clandestine marriage as surely as it would a marriage made in facie ecclesiae. Moreover, if a couple, knowing that their marriage would be invalid, engaged in a clandestine ceremony in order to avoid the enquiries normally carried out by the officiating priest before celebrating a marriage, they would be subject to severe canonical penalties, and their children would not receive the benefit of the doctrine of the putative marriage, which allowed that children born of an invalid marriage could be considered legitimate provided that at least one parent had been unaware of the existence of the impediment (see Beaumanoir, Coutumes de Beauvaisis ed. A. Salmon, §584).

Thus Ydoine's staunch refusal to give herself to Amadas before they are married does more than mark her out as "the torch-bearer of the new code" of chastity (35). Above all, it is a sign of her total dedication to her goal of marrying her lover. Determined that she and Amadas shall enjoy all the legal, social and financial benefits of a Church wedding, she sees unchastity as being, before anything else, a bar to this achievement. Her insistence on chastity is not dictated only by her moral and religious principles; it is essential for the success of her great ambition, and springs from sheer practical necessity as much as from moral conviction. As can be seen from lines 6736-50, quoted on p. 356, her view of marriage is a many-sided ideal, in which "discrepancies [of rank and fortune] are evened to the highest level, opposition of every kind gives way to general approval, all possibility of hardship vanishes, and a social paradise lies before the husband and wife, where, inseparably united by fine amor, they will live all the days of their life in happiness." (36). It is not surprising that she thinks of her plan to give herself and her lands to Amadas as:

6695      Un guerredon si rice et grant  
              Dont a tous jors a son vivant  
 [Amadas] Se tendra plus rice c'un roi.

---

(35) J. R. Reinhard, op.cit. p.173.

(36) S. Barrow, The Medieval Society Romances (New York 1924), p.47. The description applies to the marital romances in general, including Amadas.

Even less surprising is the horror with which she views Amadas' attempt to throw away for ever, for the sake of a passing pleasure, all the golden future for which she has suffered, schemed and struggled for so long.

Thus we find that in Amadas, as in Jehan et Blonde, chastity is seen to be necessary for the success of the eventual marriage. However, where Beaumanoir gives us a general principle, the author of Amadas only presents a specific case, in which chastity is necessitated by certain unusual circumstances. Apart from Ydoine's impassioned speech in the cemetery, there is little attempt in Amadas to relate chastity to general happiness in marriage. The author takes care to point out that his hero and heroine are indeed chaste, even when the need to conceal their love has ended (6930-45), and lays particular emphasis on the care they take not to give anyone grounds for malicious gossip (6953-63); but, unlike Beaumanoir, he does not bother to say why they should be chaste, or should appear to be so. When Amadas and Ydoine are eventually married, the author notes the fact that their goal has been achieved, but does not stress the part played by their chastity in achieving it (7849-61); since their restraint has had the desired result, he leaves it at that, and does not think of drawing general conclusions in favour of chastity as a preparation for marriage as Beaumanoir does in similar circumstances. In any case, he is much more interested in a quite

different aspect of the matter - the practical demonstration of the falsity of Ydoine's extraordinary story about having borne three illegitimate children to three incestuous lovers (38), and murdered all three babies with her own hands (5030-38, 5102-4, 7835-45).

Apart from bringing out the practical necessity of chastity for the success of Ydoine's marriage-plans, the author of Amadas seems to feel that chastity is desirable for its own sake, and in this one can probably see his work as an attack both on Tristan and on Cligès.

---

(38) The lovers are described as cosins germains (5032, 5103); they were therefore Ydoine's relations in the second degree of consanguinity, according to the Germanic system of computation adopted in medieval France. Marriage was forbidden on the grounds of incest between people related up to the seventh degree until 1215, though dispensations were easily granted for relations more distant than the fourth degree. Sexual relations between first cousins were therefore very shocking; the modern equivalent would be an affair between an uncle and his niece by blood. The author of Amadas, determined to make Ydoine's alleged crimes as lurid as possible, obviously delighted in adding incest to fornication and infanticide, and then multiplying the whole thing by three. It is interesting to note that Benoit de Sainte-Maure, who similarly enjoyed describing the sinfulness of the pagan Greeks, worked out that Hermione was Orestes' first cousin (the fact is not mentioned by his source, Dictys), and told his audience ironically that:

La dameisele fu mout sage  
 Qu'Orestès ot en mariage;  
 Fille ert son oncle et sa germaine.

(Troie 28543-5)

We have already drawn attention, in Part III, Chapter 2 (pp. 167-8) to the way in which Amadas was deliberately planned as an "anti-Cligès", and, as Reinhard shows, the thirteenth-century poem is also an "anti-Tristan" (37). We should also note that the mouthpiece for the author's defence of chastity is the heroine, who appears far more aware of moral issues, and especially of Christian morality, than does the hero. It is Ydoine who describes bodily possession out of wedlock as pecié, vilomnie, mal, felomnie (6727-30) and folor (6947, 6957); it is she who restrains Amadas from embarking on an illicit affair, and who insists instead on a Christian wedding in which she, the bride, is a virgin. In thus embodying his moral values in the heroine, the author of Amadas seems to share the same assumption as authors who, like Renaut, criticize the woman rather than the man for moral failings. In both cases, the responsibility for moral purity is seen to rest with the woman, and both Ydoine and Fresne do indeed uphold the moral standards entrusted to them with a spirited dedication.

In other romances where unchastity is condemned, we find much the same attitudes expressed, though the tone varies from work to work. Some of the arguments we have noted, such as the danger of pregnancy, are found very infrequently, while others reappear again and again. The concern of a woman for her reputation, and the shamefulness of illicit sexual relations, are among the

---

(37) Op.cit., pp.171-5.

points most frequently raised (38). These aspects are also very much in evidence in Jean Renart's Guillaume de Dole, the last work which I propose to examine in detail before leaving the chaste heroines for the unchaste ones.

In Guillaume de Dole, the treatment of the heroine's alleged unchastity might be described as paradoxical. Although it is a work which turns on the triumphant vindication of the heroine's purity, Jean Renart hints that chastity is not quite so important in his personal moral code. Moreover, he puts considerable emphasis on the material benefits of the marriage which is jeopardized by Llenor's "fall". Thus, although chastity is clearly important for the success of the eventual marriage — as it is in Jehan et Blonde and Amadas — its importance is practical and material, rather than moral. Yet this very materialism gives rise to a particularly censorious attitude towards unchastity on the part of some of the characters, whose invective against the "immoral" girl is more violent than any we have noted hitherto.

Of the characters in Guillaume de Dole, only Conrad himself, and possibly Jouglet, sees his projected marriage to Llenor mainly as a love-match. Guillaume and all his family, including Llenor himself, see it mainly as a source of material and social advancement,

---

(38) See, for example, Florimont 9150-52; Guillaume de Palerne 1778-81; Escanor 9972-5 and 17037-53; Protheselaus 10867-76. These passages all refer briefly to the baseness and general inadvisability of pre-marital unchastity. As far as I can discover, the danger of pregnancy is mentioned in only one other of the works used for this study — Marie's Milun, where the only person to point out the dishonour of unchastity is the heroine herself (55-64, 132-8).

and this view is shared by the wicked seneschal. However, despite their different motives, all the main characters (except, of course, the seneschal) are equally eager for the marriage to take place. They therefore have, as it were, a vested interest in Liénor's virginity, for the marriage will be impossible if she is not a virgin. This is one of the great merits which will counterbalance her poverty and her inferior rank, and enable Conrad to persuade his vassals to sanction the match. Her chastity is thus seen by all the characters concerned in furthering or preventing the marriage as a concrete asset, to be set against the terre et avoir she lacks. Those who value her chastity do not value it for itself, nor idealise it as an abstract virtue; even the languishing emperor regards it as a purely practical advantage which he personally would be quite happy to do without, were it not for the necessity of obtaining his barons' permission.

This pragmatic view of chastity largely determines the characters' attitude to unchastity. The seneschal, as Rita Lejeune points out, is simply interested in making political capital out of Liénor's supposed frailty; any other excuse to thwart Conrad's plan would have served him equally well (39). His private opinion of the moral issues involved is entirely irrelevant, and we do not even know whether he in fact disapproved of unchastity or not; it is enough for him that Conrad's barons will disapprove, and that

---

(39) Rita Lejeune, L'Oeuvre de Jean Renart, (Liège 1935), p.43, where the seneschal's motives are penetratingly analysed.

the marriage will thus be prevented. It does not even matter to the seneschal that Conrad himself should think Lïenor unworthy to be his bride; for his purpose, the only important opinion is that of the barons who actually have the power to veto the match. This is why, in making his "revelation" to the emperor, he wisely does not attempt to turn Conrad against Lïenor by any open scorn or ribaldry, but draws his attention instead to the fact that the peers of the realm will in no circumstances allow him to marry her (3552-59) (40).

Conrad himself, as we saw in discussing heroes' attitudes to brides of inferior rank, also attaches most importance to the practical consequences of Lïenor's supposed unchastity. His immediate reaction to the news is not to rail against the frailty of women, nor lament his misfortune in having loved unworthily, nor even - surprisingly enough - to abuse the man who, by his own admission, has deflowered his intended bride (41). Instead, after the first moments of numbed shock, his mind turns to the inevitable consequence: he has lost all hope of marrying Lïenor (3590-93).

---

(40) The skilful way in which the seneschal avoids any open attack on Lïenor, which might antagonize Conrad, is pointed out by Rita Lejeune, *op.cit.* p.44.

(41) Conrad's reaction contrasts with that of the count of Poitiers, who attacks the seducer and knocks him out. See Le Roman du Comte de Poitiers, ed. Bertil Malmberg, (Lund 1940), lines 352-60. Conrad, on the other hand, seems almost to be grateful to the seneschal for making his revelation and thus sparing him public embarrassment. Instead of rejoicing at the seneschal's discomfiture when Lïenor makes her accusation, Conrad appears to be sorry for him because, after all, he has served him well (4874-5, 4952-5). Gérard, in La Violette, does not even speak to Lisiart on learning of his alleged seduction (lines 960-1007).



Thus his first thought is for the success of his plans, and the result that Llenor's unchastity will have in practice is uppermost in his mind. Later, when he no longer has to conceal the depth of his emotions from the seneschal (42), Conrad admits to his undying hatred for the traitor (3606-8); his feelings for Llenor, however, are unchanged by the news that she is not the virgin he had thought her. He would still like to marry her, if it were possible (3904-7); he does not blame her for her immorality, but instead pities her and Guillaume deeply for their disappointment (3604-15, 3696-7, 3900-3903); and his romantic amour de loin is in no way diminished, but seems almost to be enhanced by his new image of himself as one of love's martyrs (3744-65, 3874-99, 4118-42) (43). Thus the chief effect of Llenor's supposed lack of virtue, as far as Conrad is concerned, is that it checkmates his plan to make her his queen by tricking the barons into agreement. He seems almost unaware of the moral aspect of the seneschal's revelation; apart from telling Guillaume that Llenor's

---

(42) In L'Oeuvre de Jean Renart, pp.44-5, Rita Lejeune gives a brief but illuminating analysis of the attitudes of Conrad and the seneschal during this interview. It is to her that I am indebted for the idea that Conrad's apparent unconcern springs from his "volonté de feindre l'indifférence la plus complète".

(43) For the theme of amour de loin in Guillaume de Dole, see R. Lejeune, op.cit. pp.37-42 and 52-3, where the importance of this previously neglected element is brought out. Conrad's somewhat narcissistic love reminds one at times of the love-lorn Orsino, who also needs very little external stimulus to nourish his affection.

3700      ...pris est mout desavanciez  
              De mainte gent qui sont alé  
              Entor li, tant qu'el a folé,

he makes no attempt to criticize her immorality, and clearly regards her as more sinned against than sinning. This tolerant attitude fits in well with the picture given at the start of the romance of the light-hearted emperor who preferred dalliance to hunting, and it seems possible that Jean Renart may have included the opening scenes partly as a preparation for Conrad's later indulgent view of Lïenor's alleged failings.

Conrad's tolerance is balanced by the violent abuse Lïenor receives from her brother and her cousin. Guillaume calls her "la vieus, la jaianz, la jaieus...Lïenor, la vils bordeliere, Qui s'est trete d'onor arriere" (3807-3810). For his cousin, she is among other things "la jaiiaus, la mautriz" (3921); her behaviour is "ribaudie" (3923), and, like all women, she is incapable of setting her honour above her desires (3836-41). All this invective, however, is not provoked by pure moral indignation. Like Conrad and the seneschal, Guillaume and his cousin see Lïenor's unchastity as the barrier to her marriage, and their rage is provoked by the withdrawal of such golden prospects for their family. In the case of the nephew, this disappointment is combined with anxiety about his uncle, who seems likely to die of chagrin, and he goes off to Dole to avenge Guillaume as well as to punish Lïenor:

3 54 Je m'en vois por vos geter d'ire  
 Et por amender ceste honte...  
 3954 Il n'avra que .VII. jors mardi  
 Que je me parti de Maience,  
 Ou ge lessai mon oncle en ce:  
 Ou il est morz ou il se muert.  
 3958 A foi, la male morz acuert  
 La desloial qui l'a houni,  
 Abessié et avileni,  
 Qu'el a perdu cele hautece!

Both he and Guillaume, however, share the view that Lienor's unchastity, and her consequent failure to become empress, are a disgrace for the family. Guillaume tells his nephew that Lienor:

3810 ...s'est trete d'onor arriere  
 Et a rebours ciaux en avant  
 Qui a moi erent atendant (44),

and his narration is summed up as "comment el les avoit honiz"

(3815; my italics). His nephew replies that, like all women,

Lienor is behaving in a way calculated "por fere honte a lor amis"

(3837), and, as can be seen in lines 3959-61, quoted above,

---

(44) For these lines, Lecoy gives as probable the interpretation: "(elle) qui s'est éloignée (de la voie) de l'honneur et qui m'a désormais aliéné (qui a fait s'écarter de moi) ceux qui me servaient (p r considération pour l'amitié que me témoignait l'empereur)". (CFMA ed., Paris 1962, p.183). This interpretation seems to me far more acceptable than that given by R. Lejeune in her edition of the romance (Paris, 1936), p.160: "non seulement Liénor a failli aux règles de l'honneur, mais, par sa faute, elle a déplacé le sens des valeurs, 'elle a poussé en avant des gens qui aspiraient à la situation de son frère'." Nevertheless, I feel that Lecoy may have been misled in taking "ciaus...qui a moi erent atendant" to refer to Guillaume's fair-weather friends at court. TL gives many examples of atendre a used in the sense of "depend on, trust in" ("seinen Sinn gerichtet halten; ...erwarten, gefasst sein, sich verlassen auf"), which is also the sense of the expression in line 4670 of Guillaume de Dole, and it seems that this fairly common meaning of atendre a would fit perfectly well in this context, being a reference to Guillaume's family and other dependents (the grant mesnie of line 4040).

he believes that Guillaume in particular is houni, abessie and avileni by the fact that Llenor has lost the empire. Thus the sense of shame reinforces that of loss, and increases the rage and grief of Guillaume and his nephew; indeed, as the nephew realises, the loss of fortune alone is not enough to account for such distress:

3800      Que si prodons ne feïst mie  
              Ne por porte ne por avoir  
              Tel doel.

Thus Guillaume looks on Llenor's alleged unchastity both as the cause of loss of rank and fortune for his family, and as a disgrace which affects them all, not her alone. His nephew shares this view, and is all the more incensed against Llenor because the combined effects of her looseness seem likely to lead to an even greater loss - that of Guillaume's life. Neither of them is primarily concerned with the morality of the act, which affects them mainly in the shape of the family dishonour occasioned by the publicising of Llenor's unchastity.

As for Llenor and her mother, they are naturally distressed at the imputation, but they too attach more importance to the practical results of the seneschal's lie than to the slander on Llenor's chastity. Guillaume's mother is most affected by the realisation that her son may be dying, and that she is indirectly the cause:

3990 "Je, fet la mere, en doi avoir  
 Tote la honte et tot le blasme.  
 Ele clot les oïls, si se pasme  
 Por le destrece de son fil  
 3994 Que il lessa en tel peril  
 Et entre la mort et la vie.

On recovering from her faint, her lament is all for Guillaume. In such a crisis, she very naturally has little emotion to spare for a slander on her daughter's reputation which she in any case knows to be unfounded (4012-25). Llenor herself knows that her honour is at stake (4268-70), but she does not waste her energy in indignation over the slur on her good name. She is far more concerned with recovering the empire, and with saving her brother, and sets out immediately to achieve both ends (4026-57). These practical considerations are reinforced by concern for the honour of the family (4057), but Llenor's main reason for vindicating that honour, and her own, is that to do so is the only way to save Guillaume and to become empress. In making her final plea before the emperor's court, she makes it quite clear that she has not gone to so much trouble simply to have her chastity publicly acknowledged:

5084 Ce ont bien vef li baron  
 Que li juïses l'en sauva,  
 Et moi et lui, et qu'il ne m'a  
 Despucelee ne honie.  
 5088 Se l'onor et la segnorie  
 De cest regne m'est destinee,  
 Ceste lasse, ceste exploree,  
 Quant ele fet n'a la deserte,  
 5092 Por quel reson i avra perte?  
 De ce demant a la cort droit.

In this speech, Llenor shows how she, too, sees her reputation for chastity as the means of marrying the emperor. She values her honour for the good fortune it will bring her and her family, rather than for itself. Chastity and marriage are related in her mind as cause and effect, and she pays scant attention to any moral reasons for preserving her virginity.

Thus Llenor, like so many of the other characters in Guillaume de Dole, sees chastity primarily as a means of achieving a certain goal. The goal is marriage to Conrad, which, as all the characters realise, represents an undreamt-of rise in rank and fortune for Llenor and her family. Seeing marriage in such material terms, the characters in the romance tend to look on chastity in the same way, so that it becomes almost a material asset, and the moral implications of Llenor's alleged failing are obscured. Paradoxically, although the development of the plot depends on the idea that unchastity is morally wrong, this idea is seldom specifically mentioned by the characters. They see unchastity, not so much as a sin, but as a means of gaining or losing prestige and wealth. Indeed, the only one of the main characters, apart from the spectator Jouglet, who makes no explicit reference to the financial <sup>and</sup> social benefits Llenor's chastity will win for her family is, curiously enough, Guillaume's mother, who is so concerned about the effect of the loss and shame on Guillaume himself that she has no attention to spare for the cause of Guillaume's trouble. Even Conrad is well aware that the projected

marriage is a great social advance for Ilenor and her family, and sympathises with her and Guillaume over the loss and harm her unchastity has caused (3604-15). Although he, like Guillaume and his nephew, refers to Ilenor's alleged unchastity in terms which suggest moral disapproval (3700-3702), this aspect has little importance for Conrad, and its importance to Ilenor's brother and nephew is largely the fruit of their rage at the loss her misconduct has occasioned.

This emphasis on the material loss caused by the heroine's unchastity is not unique to Jean Renart. In Le Roman du Comte de Poitiers, the count accuses his wife of having lost him "ma cointe cité de Poitiers" and many others castles through her alleged love-affair (45), and Gérard de Nevers, too, is concerned about the loss of his domain through Euriout's unchastity (46). However, the material loss attracts far more attention in Guillaume de Dole than in either of these two works, even though Guillaume and his family have in fact sustained no real damage; they are merely disappointed in their great expectations, while Gérard de Nevers and the count of Poitiers lose everything they have.

---

(45) Le Roman du Comte de Poitiers, ed.cit., lines 504-6. The lands won and lost in the wager are also given prominence by king Pepin (439-48, 1226-9) and by the duke of Normandy (350-52).  
 (46) La Violette lines 980-6, 5681-2, 6097-6100, 6172-5.

At the same time, Le Comte de Poitiers and La Violette attach more importance to unchastity itself, apart from its financial consequences, than does Guillaume de Dole. The count of Poitiers determines to kill his wife because of her infidelity, rather than because she has lost him his lands (see lines 501-35), while she herself does not spare a thought for her husband's domains, but is bitterly grieved at the loss of her honour and at her undeserved shame (471-3, 1055-62, 1104-1112). In La Violette, although Gérard seems equally moved by the loss of Nevers and by Euriant's misbehaviour (47), and Euriant herself is a pathetic creature who expresses hardly any opinions on her fate, there is a marked contrast with Guillaume de Dole in the trial scene. The final duel between Gérard and Lisiart takes place because the king's advisers decide that it is essential that Euriant's reputation should be cleared by a public display of Lisiart's guilt; the matter of the lands, however, could have been settled without recourse to a judicial battle (6319-47). Ifenor, it will be remembered, adopts precisely the opposite scale of values in demonstrating her own chastity.

---

(47) When Gérard has abandoned Euriant, we read that "ne li caut pas de son damage/Tant com fait de biele Euriant" (1285-6). However, it is not simply Euriant's unchastity he is thinking of, but the fact that their love is no more and that he will never see her again. The same detail occurs in the Comte de Poitiers, where the hero is "tristes et dolant/Por sa terre et plus por s'amie,/La contesse qu'il a guerpie" (672-4).



Thus Jean Renart's attitude to chastity in Guillaume de Dole, when compared with the attitude found in two other romances of the cycle de la gageure, is noticeably more down-to-earth. This, of course, is what one would expect from an author whose ironic treatment of moral standards and realistic approach to money matters have frequently been commented on (48). For our purpose, it is perhaps more to the point to note that Jean Renart, in describing a situation where pre-marital chastity is of the utmost importance to a marriage, chooses to present that importance as being practical rather than moral. It is not out of devotion to any idealised concept of the sanctity of matrimony that the characters in Guillaume de Dole emphasise Ilenor's virginity, but simply because the particular marriage envisaged in the romance will not be able to take place unless Ilenor has virtue to compensate for her poverty. Indeed, as Rita Lejeune remarked, Jean Renart "n'[a] guère envisagé le mariage avec respect" (49). Mme Lejeune used the comments of Jean Renart on Conrad's wedding-night as evidence of this disrespect; one might add, on the negative side, that Conrad is *not* - as he might have been in other hands (50) - a marital idealist in search of a virgin bride, and

---

(48) For example, by G. Charlier (Mélanges Wilmotte, Paris 1910, vol.I, p.95), Ch-V. Langlois (La Vie en France au Moyen Age d'après des romans mondains, 1926, p.32), E. Hoepffner ("Renart ou Renaut?", Romania LXII (1936) pp.218, 222-4), F. Lecoy (introduction to his edition of Guillaume de Dole p.xviii) and Faith Lyons (Les Eléments Descriptifs dans le Roman d'Aventure au XIIIe siècle, Geneva 1965, p.128).

(49) R. Lejeune, L'Oeuvre de Jean Renart, (Liège 1935), p.339.

(50) Conrad contrasts with the emperor Laïs in Eracle, who deliberately sets out to find a bride who is as virtuous as she is beautiful, and threatens to kill Athanaïs when he learns that she has, after all, been unchaste. Laïs' search for a perfect bride is discussed by Miss J. M. Allinson, A Literary Study of the Roman d'Eracle, M.Phil. Lond. Univ. 1968, pp.71-85. See also Part III, Chapter 7 of the present study.

that Jean Renart makes absolutely no use of his opportunity to glorify the conjugal state as opposed to pre-marital licence. Marriage and chastity are indeed related to each other in Guillaume de Dole, but the relationship is based on practical necessity and not on a perfectionist view of marriage.

ii. Romances in which the heroine is not chaste.

In examining the works of some authors whose heroines preserve their chastity until their marriage, we found that certain arguments were advanced to justify such a course. The author, either directly or through his characters, would claim that unchastity was shameful, and particularly degrading for the girl; that it was morally wrong; and, sometimes, that it was incompatible with the dignity of marriage or that it interfered with the lovers' chances of getting married. It is now time to examine some romances in which the heroine does not preserve her chastity, and see what arguments are advanced by the opposite camp.

In fact, as we shall see, romances in which pre-marital chastity is not presented as a desirable form of conduct really make little effort to undermine the arguments we have discovered. The views of those writers who recommend chastity are, on the whole, accepted by those whose protagonists adopt the opposite course. Such authors do not generally dispute the view that

unchastity is dishonourable, orally wrong, and contrary to the true aims of marriage. Instead, they advance certain mitigating circumstances in which unchastity can be condoned, though not fully justified.

One of the most interesting of the heroines who decided not to remain chaste is Melior, the heroine of Partonopeus. This interest stems from the fact that her attitude is not clear-cut; she is intensely aware that her conduct will be thought shameful by other people, and one cannot be sure that she does not in fact think it shameful herself.

The ambiguity of Melior's attitude is apparent from the start of her association with Partonopeus. Skilled in the magic arts, she has brought the young hero to her domain, where he is invisible to the inhabitants and they to him (51). She tells him that she had expected him to lodge in one of the inferior palaces, and not in her own palais principal (1401-14). Yet, having entered the

---

(51) The two-way invisibility is curious, since the logic of the plot requires only that Partonopeus should be invisible, and not that he himself should see no-one. The author presumably derived the invisible retainers from the myth of Psyche, which is one of the sources of Partonopeus. He tries to give coherence to the two-way invisibility by the idea that Melior can only make Partonopeus invisible if he also is unable to see others; when her magic ceases, both sides are able to see each other. Moreover, the survival of the enchantment depends on Melior herself being, to a certain extent, invisible: Partonopeus can touch her and talk to her, but only in the dark. If he tries to look at her, she loses her magic powers. The prohibition on seeing the nocturnal lover is, again, derived from the myth of Psyche.

highest palace, Partonopeus is in fact led to Melior's bed by two lighted candles, presumably held by her own invisible retainers. Since the enchantments of Chef d'Oire are produced by Melior himself, it is hard to understand how Partonopeus reached her bed without her knowledge; yet, on finding him installed there, she expresses the greatest surprise and alarm, and does her best, by persuasion and by threats, to make him go away (1147-1228).

So far, it is possible to attribute these inconsistencies to the author's slightly careless handling of the magic element in this romance, and not to a deliberate ambiguity about Melior's motives in bringing Partonopeus to Chef d'Oire. The author does not seem to have worked out the logic of Melior's enchantments, and leaves us uncertain as to how Partonopeus' invisibility functions (the hero is served by Melior's household even though, we are told, they cannot see him). Now, however, it becomes apparent that the ambiguity is rooted in Melior's own character (52). Although she cries out in alarm on feeling Partonopeus in bed beside her, she is careful not to raise her voice too much:

---

(52) Although Melior has magic powers, she is not a supernatural being, and can be judged by canons of normal human psychology. Her ability to perform enchantments is the product of her superior education, not a sign of a supernatural origin, and the author makes her a realistic and attractive character.

"Escria soi et nient trop haut" (1146). She may threaten to have him thrown out by her knights, but she does not in fact make any attempt to call them, even while Partonopeus is making a determined assault on her virtue. Partonopeus himself takes her failure to carry out her threat of summoning aid as a tacit invitation:

1268        Crient que ne le tegne a mavaï,  
               Quant ele s'est en pais tenue,  
               Se il vers li ne se remue,

and he is further encouraged by the fact that his first advances are repelled in a quite unexpected way:

1277        Quant la dame a sa main sentue,  
               O repentaille l'en remue;  
               Tot suavet en estragnant  
               L'a rebotee sor l'enfant.

Nevertheless, when Partonopeus decides that he might as well take advantage of his situation, Melior resists with every appearance of conviction:

1291        Cele li dist : "Laissiés, ostés !"  
               Et il le prent par les costés;  
               Cele ses jambes ferme et lace,  
               Et cil l'estraint, vers soi l'embrace.  
 1295        "Mar le faites, fait ele, sire!"  
               Et cil vers soi la trait et tire.  
               "Ne faites, sire!" fait la bele,  
               Et il vers li tot s'achantele.  
 1299        "Laissiés, sire, fait ele, ester!"  
               Cil entent as genols sevrer.  
               "Or est amüs, fait ele, a certes!"  
               Cil li a les cuisses overtes.

Such protests certainly suggest that Melior is not willingly unchaste. Yet the ambiguity about her motives persists when we read of her behaviour after Partonopeus has fallen into a sleep of exhaustion:

1572      La dame ot molt de ses aviax:  
             Baise li iex et boche et face,  
             Et molt l'estraint et molt l'enbrace...  
 1577      Molt sovent l'esvellast, ce cuit,  
             Por avoir de lui son deduit;  
             Mais tant le tient a travellié  
             Ne l'ose esvellier de pitié.

Thus it appears that Melior was not so unwilling to be seduced as her protests suggest, and her sensuality entitles one to wonder exactly why she brought Partonopeus to Chef d'Oire in the first place. Although she plans to marry him, he will not be old enough to win her vassals' approval for two and a half years; she can hardly have expected him to spend this period at Chef d'Oire, where he can see and talk to nobody, without even the solace of a nocturnal relationship with her to relieve his loneliness. Altogether, it is difficult to see why she should have brought him to Chef d'Oire in such secrecy, if not to make him her lover. Having said this, however, I must point out that the ambiguity about Melior's motives is in no sense a flaw in the plot or characterization in Partonopeus. Rather, this is a thoroughly convincing and, indeed, charming portrayal of a very real human being, subject to the human frailties of inconsistency, mixed motives, and self-deception.

Melior herself is only too well aware of the sort of speculation to which her contradictory behaviour gives rise, and begs Partonopeus not to think ill of her for yielding so easily:

1325 Mais je n'en doi estre gabee  
 Se je de vos sui alumee,  
 N'a moi n'en doit nus max venir  
 Se jo ai fait tot vo plaisir;  
 1329 Nel me tornés pas a folie,  
 Que si vel estre vostre amie,  
 Ne por ce que sui tost vencue,  
 Ne doi plus estre mescrette.

In the vehemence of this reiterated plea, we have the key to Melior's inconsistency. Her professions of virtue and her half-serious resistance are prompted largely by her intense fear of being despised as a loose woman. She herself wants to make Partonopeus her lover; she does not believe that pre-marital chastity is the only honourable course for a well-born girl to follow. However, she knows that other people do not share her opinion, and fears that Partonopeus may be such a one. (Probably she also fears that he may suspect her of being as ready to yield to other lovers as she was to him, but this is not brought out in the text). It is thus of the utmost importance to her to ward off any scorn or suspicion which Partonopeus may feel, and it is her determination to do this, conflicting with her natural desire to give herself to the man she loves so deeply, which creates the inconsistency in her behaviour at this stage.

However, Melior does not rely on a display of reluctance alone to convince Partonopeus that she is not a wanton. She also advances arguments which, by explaining why she has yielded so soon, justify her conduct in her own eyes and will, she hopes, do so for Partonopeus as well.

Melior makes three points in her attempt to convince Partonopeus that she has acted honourably. Perhaps the most forceful of these is that she was not motivated by a temporary desire, but by genuine love. Although Partonopeus has never met her, she has in fact known and loved him for some time, and should not, therefore, be despised for giving way to the first stranger who makes a serious assault on her virtue (1361-1400). In her view, the existence of this sincere and lasting love, which is founded as much on Partonopeus' moral qualities as on his physical attributes (1369-72), justifies her decision to give herself to him at such an early stage, and he should not think of her as a flighty creature who has yielded far too quickly.

In conjunction with this argument, Melior makes a second important point. She emphasises the fact that she intends to marry Partonopeus, and had indeed chosen him from the outset as a future husband, and not as a temporary lover (1331 ff). This is the more important argument from our point of view, since it bears directly on the issue of pre-marital chastity, rather than on chastity in general.



To reinforce this argument, Melior carefully brings out the fact that her matrimonial projects fulfil all the conventions and formalities which govern the situation. She is an heiress, and is therefore expected to marry in order that her domains shall have a male ruler (1335-48). The idea that she should chose her own husband has the full support of her vassals, and was, indeed, suggested by them in the first place (1349-54). Her choice may not be acceptable to her vassals at present, since Partonopeus is too young to defend the empire; but they have agreed to defer the match for two and a half years, and there can be no doubt that, at the end of that time, they will readily endorse Melior's choice (1476-1510). Thus her promise of marriage is a perfectly serious one, and she looks on herself as being virtually betrothed to Partonopeus. The seriousness and conventionality thus imparted to their relationship justify her in anticipating the inevitable wedding-day, and giving Partonopeus a husband's rights before he enjoys a husband's status.

It will be noted that these arguments of Melior's do not seriously shake the contention that unchastity is dishonourable and wrong. Indeed, Melior seems to accept that Partonopeus would have every reason to despise and condemn her, were it not for the mitigating circumstances of her deep and sincere love and her firm intention of marrying him as soon as possible. She does not justify her conduct by declaring that unchastity is right and honourable, but tries to show that, between two people who truly

love each other and are definitely going to be married, unchastity is acceptable.

Melior's third argument in support of her claim to have high moral standards - that she had not intended to sleep with Partonopeus during his stay in her city (1401-20) - is, as we saw on pp. 374-7 of the present chapter, of dubious validity, and does not in any case constitute a justification of her unchastity. We shall not therefore discuss it any further.

Melior's defence of her decision to yield to Partonopeus is very effective; her lover assures her that, far from thinking her unprincipled, he loves her all the more for her generosity and the joy she has given him. However, Melior herself does not appear to be entirely convinced by her own arguments. Certainly she does not expect other people to adopt her view of the innocence of sexual relations between a betrothed couple; she expects to be honie if Partonopeus exposes their love-affair by seeking to see her before the time is ripe (1516-24, 1568-70). When the betrayal she dreaded has actually happened, her first coherent words refer to the shame she has brought upon herself by her unchastity (4553-8), and later she explains to Partonopeus that her courtiers will criticise her severely for having made him her lover, and that she will be exposed to grant deshonor on his account (4683-92). Her fears seem, indeed, to be well-founded; when she and Partonopeus are discovered in bed next morning, the boldest of her ladies-in-waiting:

4841 Lor dame blasment molt et cosent...  
 Et dient qu'ele mescoisi  
 Quant d'un garçon fist son ami.  
 4845 Tant poïst estre a chois alee  
 Que gentilmente fust marïee;  
 Tant bon chevalier l'atendoient  
 Qui tant bel et tant riche estoient.  
 4849 Bien l'a ses talens tresportee  
 Quant a un vallet s'est donee.  
 Et dient que feme a costume  
 Quant ses talens auques l'alume,  
 4853 C'al pior done ses amors  
 Et ne tient conte des mellors,  
 Et qu'ele a bien que feme fait,  
 Et drois est qu'ele a honte vait.

Thus Melior's behaviour is indeed regarded as shameful by other people, just as she had anticipated. She is criticised on two counts: that the lover she has chosen is unworthy (53), and — by implication — that she is unable to control her excessive sexual desire. Both these criticisms attack Melior's contention that the love inspired in her by Partonopeus' good qualities makes their sexual relationship an honourable one. In the eyes of the court ladies, Partonopeus has no good qualities to inspire love, and the "love" Melior feels is no more than base physical desire. The criticisms of Melior's lack of self-control also constitute an implicit attack on Melior's view that it is acceptable to sleep with the man one is going to marry, for the court ladies' taunts seem to be based on the belief that

---

(53) The ladies-in-waiting assume that Partonopeus is unworthy because of his evident youth. Clearly he is too young to be a knight, and they refer to him contemptuously as "un garçon" (4844), a term frequently implying menial status in Old French.

she should in any case have shown enough control to wait until she actually was married. It is because of her failure on this count that Melior "a honte vait". She herself, in the despair of her first realisation that she has been exposed, brings this very accusation against herself:

4557      Trop me hastai de mon servise,  
             Par tant me sui a honte mise.

Melior's bitter words are an accurate pre-figuration of the attitude of her censorious companions; her apparent lack of discrimination compounds the fault in their eyes, but it is not the sole basis of their objections.

The ladies-in-waiting are, of course, mistaken in their belief that Partonopeus is unworthy of Melior's love, and we can neglect this as an argument against Melior's justifications of her behaviour. Once the court ladies realise that Partonopeus is not a kitchen-knave but an extremely good-looking young nobleman, they no longer feel inclined to criticise their mistress' choice (4863-78). Indeed, as Melior's sister Urraque points out, as far as her choice of lover is concerned Melior's conduct is indeed right and honourable:

4931      Amé l'avés sor tote rien,  
             Si avés fait raison et bien,  
             Que que deüssent nos compaignes...  
 4939      Car a plus bel ne a mellor  
             Ne peüssiés avoir amor.

Thus Urraque disposes of the argument that Melior's sensuality had led her to choose an unworthy partner. She then goes on to deal with the argument that, no matter how suitable Partonopeus might be as a husband, Melior has in any case disgraced herself by sleeping with him before their wedding. With sisterly detachment, she penetrates the source of Melior's distress:

4997      C'est ce dont plus avés torment  
              Que vostre amor savront la gent,  
              Et ço que serés descoverte  
              Vos grieve plus que l'autre perte.

Urraque's insight confirms our impression that, whatever Melior's own opinion of her conduct may be, she is most concerned about the opinion of other people, who are more likely to see her lack of chastity as a disgrace (54). However, Urraque believes that her sister can very easily avoid the censure she so much fears. All she has to do is to call her vassals together, and explain to them that she has chosen Partonopeus as a husband, and that he is eminently suitable for the post. When they actually see Partonopeus, they will realise that he is indeed an ideal emperor, and will sanction the marriage without difficulty (5001-5030). Thus Melior will best free herself from shame:

5031      Ensi vos porois al mien conte  
              Plus bel delivrer de la honte.

---

(54) A similar attitude is found in Cligès, where Fenice, it will be remembered, is intensely concerned about her reputation.

Urrique's plan for getting out of the shameful situation shows that she shares Melior's belief that there is no shame in unchastity provided that the man concerned is one's future husband. Great care must be taken to present Partonopeus to the vassals in this light; he must be hidden until Melior has announced her engagement and persuaded her vassals that the man she has chosen is suitable (5005, 5025-6); the vassals must not be allowed to find out about Partonopeus' presence in Chef d'Oire for themselves, but must first learn of Melior's marriage-plans from her own lips (5012-8). The whole point of the operation is to get her vassals' consent to the marriage, so that Melior can free herself from shame by marrying the man who has been her lover. The only alternative, as far as Urrique can see, is for Melior to marry someone else, and this would not meet the situation at all:

5033      Car s'autre devient vostre dru  
              Donc en avreis vos dous oï.  
              Et cil tos jors a un ami,  
              Si vos reproveroit cestui. (55)

Thus Melior's argument that her intention to marry Partonopeus makes their relationship acceptable, if not altogether honourable, is, apparently, felt by her sister and, it seems, her vassals, to be a valid one, but only if the intention is actually carried out.

---

(55) I have quoted from Gildea's edition of the Berne ms. In other mss., the reading of lines 5035-6 makes the sense clearer: "Et cil tos jors a (var. en) son ami/Vos retrairoit l'uevre cestui". Urrique evidently means that any subsequent lover (in the context, this refers to the husband Melior's vassals will choose for her) would resent her pre-marital affair and reprove her for having had a lover.

If Melior does not in fact marry Partonopeus, she will not be "delivree de la honte", and in particular she will expose herself to censure from her eventual husband. Urraque does not suggest that Melior should present Partonopeus to her vassals as the lover whom she intends to marry, and thus avoid being shamed; Melior must actually get the marriage formalities under way by obtaining her vassals' permission for the match, before she can reveal Partonopeus' presence without scandal.

Even with this qualification, the view of unchastity presented in Partonopeus is very different from that of the romances where the lovers do not consummate their love before marriage. In Galeran, Jehan et Blonde or Amadas, the couple's intention to marry is not seen as an excuse for unchastity, but as an argument against it. This is particularly obvious in Jehan et Blonde, where Beaumanoir contends that the lovers' marriage would be less perfect if they had fulfilled their love beforehand, and also opposes marriage and unchastity on the practical level. In Galeran, considerable emphasis is laid on the lovers' intention to marry each other (1588-91, 1610-21, 1827-33), but this is not seen as a reason for unchastity, nor even as a means of covering up the shame of an illicit affair. Instead, the marriage-plans of Galeran and Fresne are felt almost to be a guarantee that they will be chaste, and there is an attempt to contrast betrothal with an unchaste love-affair which does not lead to marriage.

However, the attitude found in Partonopeus is far from unique, despite S. Barrow's statement that this romance is "unmoral to a degree rare in the romances that end in marriage" (56). When Floriant and Florete are discovered in the orchard, she laments:

4538 Or sai je bien que morte serai,  
C'iert pour vous, biaux tres dous amis,  
Lasse! vous m'aviez promis  
Que vous a fame me penriez.

Floriant replies that he will indeed marry her the next day, and all concerned - even Florete's irate father - feel that Florete's honour is saved by this marriage. The author of Cristal et Clarie, having copied the seduction scene word for word from Partonopeus, goes on to elaborate Urrique's suggestion that Melior will only be dishonoured if she does not marry Partonopeus, and has to take a different husband. The shameless Clarie, having "proved" that Cristal was not in her bedroom after all, goes on to demand that she be given Cristal as a husband:

9040 D'autre baron ne prendrai rien,  
Puisque je ai de lui le cri,  
Que foloiet ai [a]voec lui.  
S'ensi fust c'altres hon m'avoit  
9044 Et ja vers moi se corechoit,  
Reprovier de Cristal oroie,  
Et je lors de doel me moroie,  
Quant a tort seroie laidie,  
9048 Qu'ainc ne pensai jor de ma vie.

---

(56) The Medieval Society Romances, p.37.



Claiming that she is dishonoured by her father's unjust suspicions, Clarie uses the theory that marriage can save the reputation of an unchaste girl to blackmail her father into arranging the match (9023 ff). The same idea is found in the lay of Milun, where the heroine finds herself in the position envisaged by Urrique and Clarie - she has to marry a man other than her lover. From her laments at this plight, we learn that, in giving herself to Milun, she had relied on the idea that she would eventually be able to marry him:

139       Jeo ne soi pas que fust issi,  
          Ainz quidoue avoir mun ami. (57)

The romances in which pre-marital chastity is not adopted by the central characters generally seem to rely on the possibility of an eventual marriage as the justification of such behaviour. Instead of arguing that unchastity is entirely honourable, these works generally present it as an act which the lovers themselves may feel to be legitimate in view of the existence of a betrothal between them, and which outsiders will probably accept without too much censure provided that the couple do in fact marry as soon as

---

(57) The existence of a betrothal is also used to justify a sexual relationship in the Roman de Troie, where Medea insists on a formal promise of marriage from Ja on before she will help him or give herself to him (1401ff); once the promise has been exacted, she makes him her lover (1609ff), and evidently bases her justification of her unchastity on the idea that such behaviour is acceptable in a betrothed couple. This development appears to have been mainly Benoit's own invention; in Ovid's Heroides and Metamorphoses, which were probably his source, it is Jason who first suggests the marriage in return for Medea's help, not she who first suggests it as a safeguard for her passion. See also L'Escoufle, in which Guillaume defends himself against the emperor's suspicions of immorality on the grounds that he is betrothed to Aelis (3016-47).

possible. Marriage is thus used in these romances as an excuse for behaviour which, in other circumstances, would be considered reprehensible by most of the characters. This contrasts with the position in the more moral romances, where unchastity is thought reprehensible under any circumstances, and where the eventual marriage is sometimes presented as a reason for continence, instead of an excuse for licentiousness. Both camps, in fact, see marriage as a remedy for human lustfulness; but they interpret the way the remedy should be applied rather differently.

However, as we have already pointed out, in most cases it is the woman's concupiscence which is castigated, and not that of the man. It is Liënor, not Conrad's seneschal, whose reputation is jeopardized; it is Melior, not Partonopeus, who dreads scandal and censure; it is she, with her sisters Florete and Clarie, who need to clear their good names by marrying their lovers, while the lovers themselves seem to fear no blame or loss of reputation. In this, the romances are an accurate reflection of feudal society, which, as G. Duby as shown, set marriage "at the pinnacle of a system of values" in which the chastity of the bride was an essential element, since it affected the legitimacy of children. "This current of thought", states Duby, "exalted virginity for young girls, who were enjoined to preserve their sexual purity, reticence, and modesty before marriage." (58).

---

(58) Two Models of Marriage (Baltimore and London, 1978), p.15.

At the same time, "the sexual activity of males was not imprisoned within the confines of marriage. Men were proud of their sexual exploits" (59). This dual standard, it should be said, is more characteristic of lay values than of Church ones at this period, for the Church enjoined chastity on men as much as on women.

Before leaving this question of dual standards, I would like to comment on one final example, that of Dido in the Roman d'Eneas. The emphasis here is firmly placed on the shamefulness and dishonour of Dido's conduct. The queen is honie (2050) and vergondee (1540, 1936); her affair is described as hontage (1529), putage (1572) and felenie (1535, 1568); she is defamee (1579). Eneas is associated with Dido's shame only in two passages. Rumour says that :

1572	Or la maintient cil an putage. An luxure andui se demeinert...
1578	Et l'un et l'autre s'i foloie.

This is followed shortly by a criticism of Eneas for abandoning his journey:

1608	Or la tient cil a descovert, Son afaire a mis en obli Et tot son oirre deguerpi...
1613	Toz est livrez a male voe, Et terre et fame tient por soe.

Significantly, both these passages where Eneas is criticised have direct parallels in Virgil. The first is based on Rumour's

---

(59) Op.cit., p.92.

description of the lovers who, turpique cupidine captos, pass the winter in luxu (Aeneid IV 193-4); the second occurs at the same point - immediately before the gods' message to Eneas - as Virgil's remark that the lovers are oblitos famae melioris (Aeneid IV 221). The Old French poet's strictures on Dido, on the other hand, have few counterparts in the Aeneid. The felenie of line 1535 is the equivalent of Virgil's culpam, the fault which, in both texts, Dido tries to cover up by calling herself Eneas' wife (Aeneid IV 172); the French Dido's lament that "Ci perc mon nom, tote ma gloire" (2053) is based on Virgil's extinctus pudor et...fama prior (IV 322-4). Thus there is comparatively little in Virgil on the shamefulness of Dido's unchastity (60), and the censure falls more equally on both lovers than it does in the Roman d'Eneas.

Another difference between Eneas and the Aeneid lies in the treatment of Dido's vow of fidelity to her dead husband, Sychaeus.

---

(60) Virgil does, however, include two lines whose possibly shameful connotations are not echoed by the author of Eneas : Dido reflects that

Non licuit thalami expertem sine crimine vitam  
Degere more ferae, talis nec tangere curas. (IV 550-1)

These lines immediately precede a reference to her vow of fidelity to Sychaeus, which, as we shall see, was evidently the most striking feature of this passage for the Old French author.

This vow is mentioned twice by Virgil, in lines 15-29 and 552 of Book IV (61). The first of these two references is fairly closely translated by the author of Eneas (1304-20), but the second is elaborated into 10 lines (1988-98) in which Dido laments having broken her vow to so little purpose. The author of Eneas also adds a further passage in which the Lybian princes fulminate against Dido's typically female lack of fidelity to her vow (1589-1604), which has no counterpart in Virgil (it is substituted for Iarbas' prayer in which he derides Dido's poverty and inferior status, rather than her infidelity to Sychaeus). The most striking alteration, however, occurs in the scene in which Dido meets Sychaeus in Hades. In Virgil, she runs for comfort to a loving and sympathetic husband (VI 472-4); but in Eneas, we are firmly told that Sicheus "en s'amor a maior droit" than Eneas (2656), and that Dido:

2657	Por ce qu'el li avoit mentie La foi qu'el li avoit plevie Ne s'osoit pas vers lui torner, Ne ne l'osot mie esgarder,
2661	Ne pres de lui ne s'aprismot: Por son forfeit se vergondot.

Thus the author of Eneas shows considerably more concern than does Virgil with the rights of Dido's husband, and with the

---

(61) A further reference to Sychaeus, who seems to call to Dido on the night before her death (Aeneid IV 460-1), is neglected by the author of Eneas, possibly because he considered it a piece of pagan superstition.

infringement of her vow. He evidently feels that Dido's unchastity is all the more wicked because it is combined with infidelity, and her breach of faith appears to him to be inexcusable; he cannot bring himself to copy Virgil's picture of a forgiving husband, but stresses instead the separation which Dido's misdeed has created between her and Sychaeus. In this, he shows some concern for the good order of the marriage relationship; although Sychaeus is dead, Dido is still bound to him by her vow, and she has no right to give to another the love she had promised to her husband (62). However, it is also possible that the author saw Dido's pledge as the equivalent of the vow of chastity which was sometimes taken by pious widows in the twelfth century, and was therefore particularly shocked at her breach of it. His attitude seems in some ways to be influenced by the orthodox Church view of widows, who were especially respected when chaste, and were encouraged to remain widows instead of remarrying; remarriage was not sacramental, and in some areas it was even seen as a fault for which a penance

---

(62) Cp. A. Pauphilet, "Eneas et Enée", Romania 55 (1929), p.212: "notre poète considère le mariage, ainsi que le faisait l'Eglise de son temps, comme un lien que la mort même ne peut briser; ... pour lui Didon est une infidèle".

could be imposed (63). Even more blame was attached to the widow who abandoned her chaste state without even entering into a new marriage. In Eneas, the frequent reminders of the fact that Dido is Sychaeus' widow, and has vowed to be faithful to him, combined with the author's noticeably censorious attitude to her conduct, seem to reflect some such view of the importance of continence in a widow.

The reader may remember, however, that Eneas himself is a widower. Significantly, we find that the author of Eneas consistently plays down this fact. Virgil's moving story of the loss of Creusa is reduced to a terse five-line account (1180-84), and by the time Lavinia appears on the scene, Creusa has been forgotten altogether (see lines 9038 ff). Obviously, the Old French poet made this adaptation largely in order to prepare for Eneas' role as Lavinia's lover and eventual husband; nevertheless, one may wonder whether he was not also seeking to shield his hero from the blame he heaps on the errant widow, Dido.

---

(63) In the early twelfth century, Hugh of Amiens argued that the remarriage of a widow or widower, though "bonne et honnête", was not a sacrament. Such marriages were not normally blessed by a priest; in Jostice et Plet 10 XXII i, we read of a priest who was suspended for blessing the marriage of a widow to a widower. The same chapter, §3, notes that "haute béneïçon n'est pas en segont mariage, que l'en ne face tort au sacremant". As G. Lepointe puts it: "L'Eglise, toute en admettant la pluralité des union successives, considèrait que les secondes noces entraînaient une certaine déchéance"; for example, a man who had married a widow, or a widower who had remarried, was not able to be ordained a priest after his wife's death. (Droit Romain et Ancien Droit Français, Paris 1958, p.211, §403). The Church's distrust of merry widows went back to St Paul, who said in I Tim. V 4-13 that young Christian widows were all too ready to marry pagans and lose their faith, and urged a life of continence for widows. R. Metz gives a clear summary of the Church's attitude to widows on pp.91-2 of his article "Le Statut de la Femme en Droit Canonique", Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin XI (1962). See also J. Vergier-Boimond, "Bigamie (l'irrégularité de)", DDC II col.853 f., where the canonical view of remarriage is set out.

Finally, let us look at a heroine whose unchastity escapes almost entirely from censure. Chrétien's Fenice, as many critics have pointed out, is intensely concerned about her personal reputation (63). This reputation, however, seems untarnished throughout the romance. None of the other characters breathes a word of criticism against her, with the exception, of course, of the three Salerno doctors, who are so unsympathetic that their opinion of Fenice appears as odious as their treatment of her. Otherwise, not even Alis condemns his wife; his rage and insults are all directed against Cligès and Jehan. Nor do Chrétien's authorial comments suggest anything other than a favourable view of his heroine's actions. It is noticeable, moreover, that Fenice does not have to justify her unchastity by any of the arguments resorted to by other heroines. She does not need, as does Melior, to defend herself against charges of immorality on the grounds that she is going to marry her lover. Indeed, it should be noted that Fenice is the only one of the heroines discussed here whose love-affair is not pre-marital in intention. She formulates no plan for marrying Cligès, and, as far as we can see, thinks of no future apart from one of illicit love.

Yet Fenice does seem at one point to seek to justify her behaviour. To do so, she turns to one of the highest authorities,

---

(63) See, for example, G. Paris, Mélanges de Littérature Française du Moyen Age (Paris 1912), p.291; J. Frappier, Le Roman Breton: Cligès (Cours de Sorbonne, Paris 1951), p.54; A. Fourrier, Le Courant Réaliste (Paris 1960), p.177.



St Paul himself:

5264      Mes le comandemant saint Pol  
             Fet boen garder et retenir:  
             Qui chaste ne se vialt tenir,  
             Sainz Pos a feire bien anseingne  
 5268      Si sagement que il n'an preingne  
             Ne cri, ne blasme, ne reproche.

As Foerster said, "Dass sich die sonderbare Moral bei Paulus nicht findet, braucht wohl nicht eigens erwähnt zu werden." (64). The nearest St Paul came to such a "teaching" was his statement: "If they cannot contain, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn." (I Cor. 7, 9). Fenice's words are the equivalent of si non caste, tamen caute, "ce brocard qui a tant couru dans le monde clérical d'autrefois" (65). For Chrétien to make his heroine "justify" her conduct in this way is simply an example of his ironic humour, and indicates that, for him, her behaviour needs no justification (or, possibly, that it cannot be justified) (66). Chrétien's attitude is, indeed, ambiguous. Although, as we have seen, he avoids all explicit criticism of Fenice, he nevertheless closes his romance with a mocking comment on the fate of subsequent empresses, kept in seclusion "plus por peor que por le hasle" (6659), which indicates clearly enough "what the world thought" of Fenice.

---

(64) In his edition of Cligès (Halle, 1884), p.349.

(65) G. Paris, Mélanges..., p.292, n.1.

(66) Chrétien's irony in this passage is commented on by P. Haidu in Aesthetic Distance in Chrétien de Troyes (Geneva 1968), pp.91-2, where he describes it as an example of Chrétien's "freewheeling intellectual fantasy and aesthetic playfulness" (p.92, n.137). Similarly, in his article "Profanity and its Purpose in Chrétien's Cligès and Lancelot" (FMIS 6, 1970, pp.37-48), D. D. R. Owen remarks on the irony of this passage, and also on the use of irreverence to suggest a dual interpretation of Fenice's conduct.

At the conclusion of this chapter, we are, I believe, able to see more clearly that it is normally the heroine who is made the guardian of moral standards in the romances under consideration. It is she who, in most cases, decides whether the couple shall be chaste or unchaste. If strict morality is not observed, it is the heroine who expects, and often encounters, censure, shame and scandal. Seen in a negative light, this moral reprobation heaped on the female partner in an illicit love-affair can be interpreted as a reflection of the dual standard by which men's and women's morals were judged in this period, as in many others. Taken in a more positive sense, we may interpret the censure of the unchaste heroine as a justifiable indignation of society against failings in the very people to whom its moral standards have been entrusted. However, we should also note that censure is not the only reaction to unchastity in a heroine. Melior and Fenice are most attractive and sympathetic figures, and in some ways they incarnate respectively generosity and, paradoxically, purity. Finally, such heroines are often a source of humour, ranging from the witty fabliaux of Melior's seduction or Clarie's trick on her father to the subtle irony of Chrétien in Cligès.

### Chapter 3. The Heroine's Attitude to Marriage Without Love

Many heroines of the group of romances with which we are concerned have to face an unwelcome suitor (1). Such offers of marriage may come from men who are in themselves objectionable as husbands, such as pagans, old or ugly men, men of low birth or men of unpleasant disposition; in other cases, the suitor would be a perfectly acceptable husband, and the heroine's only reason for refusing him is that she does not love him, having already given her heart to another. The existence of a prior attachment is, indeed, the most common reason for rejecting the undesired suitor, and reinforces the heroine's aversion in those cases where the suitor is also personally objectionable.

---

(1) As we saw above, in Part III, Chapter 3, note 4, S. Barrow has pointed out that: "During the period of separation which proves the strength and sincerity of the betrothal vows of the hero and heroine, one of the commonest tests is a counter matrimonial engagement" (The Medieval Society Romances, p.40). In this chapter, we shall consider unwelcome suitors who present themselves before the betrothal of hero and heroine, as well as those who test the strength and sincerity of such betrothals.

In a few instances, however, the heroine repulses offers of marriage before she has fallen in love with the hero; in such circumstances, she is often motivated by pride as well as by a personal objection to the man concerned.

Unwelcome offers of marriage may be reinforced by pressure from a heroine's parents, or from her vassals, in the romances where the heroine is a ruler in her own right. It is unusual, however, to find the heroine of one of the romances in our group being forced into marriage by her feudal overlord, even though it seems that such situations occurred not infrequently in real life (2). The unwelcome suitor himself may put pressure on the heroine to marry him, by making war on her country and, in some cases, by laying siege to her capital city (3).

---

(2) For examples of pressure from overlords, see the section on Vis in Part II above, pp.89-92, and the books and articles referred to there, especially F. Jouon des Longrais, "Le Statut de la Femme en Angleterre", Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin XII (1962) pp.157-60, and J. Dauvillier, "Le Consentement Seigneurial au Mariage des Vassaux, et particulièrement des vassales, dans les textes normands", Revue Historique de Droit Français et Etranger XIV (1935) pp.795-8.

(3) In her article "The Besieged Ladies in Arthurian Romance", PMLA LXIII (1948) pp.803-830, Miss H. Newstead lists the heroines and other female characters of Arthurian romance who are besieged, usually by a rejected suitor. Examples from non-Arthurian romances are: La Fièvre (Ipomedon), Ganor (Ille et Galeron), Guillaume's sister (Guillaume de Palerne) and L'Orgueilleuse d'Amor (Blancandin).

In the great majority of the romances here considered, the heroine resists every attempt to force her into marrying anyone but the man she loves. The methods employed by such heroines are usually devious, especially where a father or a group of vassals has to be outwitted. In most cases, this resistance is successful, and the heroine manages to delay marrying the man she does not love until the hero has had time to come to her rescue. Three of our heroines, however, are less fortunate, and find themselves obliged to marry men whom they cannot love. The stories of two of these girls - Fenice and Ydoine - are strongly influenced by the Tristan legend, which provided the prototype for the loveless marriages described in them. The third case is that of Gratiene, the wife of Guillaume d'Angleterre, whose decision to marry the elderly Gleolaïs is forced on her by her reduced circumstances, and not by parental pressure as in the cases of Fenice and Ydoine. Gratiene, in fact, does not find her inability to love Gleolaïs an insuperable barrier to their marriage, and in this, if in nothing else, she resembles two other heroines who are more than willing to marry men with whom they are not in love : Liénor and Athanaïs, the heroines of Guillaume de Dole and Eracle (4). These three examples show us that a suitor with whom the heroine is not in love is not necessarily unwelcome as a husband, and this fact should be borne in mind while we discuss some of the heroines who do resist loveless marriages.

---

(4) Gratiene, Liénor and Athanaïs are discussed in Chapter 4 below.

In order to illustrate some of the different circumstances in which a heroine may be faced with an unwelcome proposal, and some of the ways in which different heroines react to such a situation, we shall look at some stories of unwanted suitors, chosen either because they represent certain frequently-recurring features, or on the contrary because they contain unusual situations or attitudes.

We shall start with the story of Lavinia, whose hand is sought by both Turnus and Eneas. This early version of the theme contains some features which are common to many unwanted-suitor situations, and other features which are comparatively unusual.

One of the common features is Lavinia's attitude to her predicament. Her reason for finding Turnus an unwelcome suitor is that she does not love him, but loves Eneas instead; and she objects so strongly to Turnus that she would rather die than be his wife. As we shall see, this emphasis on love, and this feeling that death is better than an unwanted marriage, are found in many other heroines.

The importance attached to love can be seen particularly clearly in Lavinia's case. Before falling in love with Eneas, she apparently had no objection to marrying Turnus, to whom she was already betrothed. The author mentions Latinus' dislike of the match (3230 ff), but not Lavinia's, and the queen, trying to

persuade her daughter to love Turnus and not Eneas, finds that she has no idea what love is, and no preference for either of the rivals as a husband (7857-8024). The advent of love, however, immediately polarises Lavinia's ideas about her marriage. Her true heart is incapable of loving both rivals at once (8257-8307), or of changing its allegiance from Eneas to Turnus (8617 ff); henceforward Eneas is the only man she will marry, and she repeatedly thinks that, if Turnus wins her in the battle, she will kill herself rather than marry him (8327 ff; 8745-8; 9313 ff). Thus it is her love for Eneas which makes Lavinia recoil from the idea of marrying Turnus, whom she had previously found quite acceptable as a husband.

The importance of Lavinia's love becomes still more evident when one considers that, viewed objectively, there is little to choose between the rivals as husbands. Indeed, Turnus might seem the better choice. Eneas is handsome and reputed to be very brave (8047 ff); Turnus, too, is handsome, as the queen points out (8493), and his eagerness to go to war over Lavinia is proof of his courage (3457 ff). Lavinia is extremely uncertain of the state of Eneas' feelings towards her; his reception of her love-message is apparently cold (8887-91), and his seeming indifference leads her at one stage to believe the accusation of homosexuality made against him by her mother (9119 ff). On the other hand, she has no reason to doubt Turnus' affection for her,

and makes no attempt to deny that Turnus does indeed love her, as her mother takes care to emphasise (7863-86; 7951; 8479 ff). Moreover, Eneas is an impoverished exile who will be unable to settle any dower on his wife (3320-6), while Turnus is an established Laurentian prince (3235-6) (5). Eneas' suit may be favoured by Lavinia's father, but her mother prefers Turnus.

In short, Eneas' only obvious advantages over Turnus are the favour of the gods and his exceptionally noble lineage. These factors, however, do not seem to influence Lavinia in choosing him rather than Turnus. Indeed, she makes no attempt to compare the merits of the pair as potential husbands; the question is decided for her by the simple fact of her love for Eneas, which overrides any advantages possessed by Turnus. "Amors l'a de son dart ferue" (8057): it is love, that irrational force, which strikes Lavinia and makes her adhere unswervingly to her preference for Eneas. It is not because Turnus would make a bad husband, from an objective consideration, that Lavinia rejects him so categorically, but purely because she does not love him, and loves Eneas instead. Thus we have here yet another example of the close connexion between love and marriage in a heroine's mind.

---

(5) The dower was the portion of the husband's goods destined for the maintenance of his bride if she outlived him (she would then, of course, be a dowager). The amount of the dower was normally established at the time of the marriage, and formed an important element of the negotiations between the two families before the wedding. For further information, see G. Lepointe, Droit Romain et Ancien Droit Français (Paris 1958), pp. 225-7.



The same absolute refusal to consider marriage to a man, no matter how attractive, noble, or rich, who is not the object of the heroine's love, can be seen in the stories of Gaite (Athis et Prophilias pt.I), Melior of Rome (Guillaume de Palerne), Felice (Guy de Warewic), Biauté (Gligliois - here it is Gawain himself who is the unwelcome suitor), Melior of Byzantium (Partonopeus) and Lidoine (Meraugis). (Melior will be discussed later in this chapter).

If Lavinia's attitude to her situation is commonplace, so are certain features of the situation itself. The rejected suitor who makes war on the heroine's father because he has refused him his daughter's hand is often met with in our romances. Aymon de Varennes, for example, makes it one of the mainstays of the plot in Florimont, and it seems likely, from other similarities between the two works, that he borrowed the idea directly from Eneas. The motif is also used in Athis et Prophilias, where Bilas makes war on Gaite's father. In many other romances, the theme of a war between the rejected suitor and the father of the girl he claims is applied to minor characters: examples can be seen in Yvain (Harpin de la Montagne episode), La Violette (Aigline de Vergis episode), Escanor (Colivre l'Orgueilleux episode), and in Le Chevalier as Deus Espees, where it is Gawain who delivers the girl and her father from the attacks of a rejected suitor. The fact that the theme is more often connected with secondary characters than with the heroine can probably be explained by the tendency of authors

to make the heroine mistress of her own domain, with no father alive to interfere with the hero's claim to her inheritance through marriage. As we have pointed out, heroines in the marital romances are often heiresses, and this probably reflects the eagerness of poor knights at the period to marry such girls; in the same way, the lack of a father to control the heroine's marriage can be seen to contribute to the function of the marital romances in providing a literature of wish-fulfilment for a public of young men eager to find a bride who is not only rich, but also available (6).

A rather less commonplace feature of Lavinia's story is the part played by her mother in advocating marriage to the unwanted suitor. The author of Eneas borrowed the queen's rôle in the affair from Virgil; and it is this which explains the marked difference between the activity of Lavinia's mother and that of most other mothers in the romances we are concerned with. Usually, if a mother interferes in the marriage-plan of her son or daughter, it is principally because she objects to the chosen partner, and not because she particularly favours a different candidate.

---

(6) See above, pp.136-140, and the article "Dans la France du nord-ouest au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle: les 'jeunes' dans la société aristocratique" by G. Duby in Annales - Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations XIX (1964), pp.835-46, referred to there. G. Duby also discusses the marriage-aspirations of the "jeunes" in his book Medieval Marriage (Baltimore and London 1978), pp.11-14.

Even in Florimont, where the part played by Romadanaple's mother is probably based on that of the queen in Eneas, there is no attempt to persuade the heroine that she should love the rejected suitor; Romadanaple's mother simply wants to turn her thoughts away from the destitute Florimont, and has no candidate of her own to put in his place. In most other cases where a heroine's parents are determined to make her accept an unwanted proposal, it is the father who applies the pressure, not the mother; instances can be seen in Cligès, Amadas, Guillaume de Palerne and Jehan et Blonde (7). One other example of a mother favouring the suit of an aspirant for her daughter's hand, however, occurs in one of the romans d'antiquité: in the Roman de Troie, Hecuba persuades Polixena to look favourably upon Achilles as her future husband (Troie 21229 ff). However, Achilles is not an unwanted suitor in the same sense as Turnus; although Polixena might well object to marrying the man who has killed her brother, she is careful to receive Achilles' messenger politely, and shows neither pleasure nor anger at the proposal (17986-90). It seems, indeed, that she is quite ready to allow her feelings to be swayed by her mother; she soon comes to like the idea of the marriage, and at no stage does she openly object to Achilles as a husband.

---

(7) The unwanted suitors in Amadas, Jehan et Blonde and Cligès are discussed below.

Lavinia's father, Latinus, also plays a part which differs from the more usual rôle of a father in "unwanted suitor" episodes. Unlike the fathers of Fenice, Ydoine, Melier or Blonde, he does not attempt to make his daughter marry against her will. Instead, he is on his daughter's side; he favours the suitor whom she herself prefers, and opposes the suitor to whom she objects. In this, he resembles other fathers, such as those in the episodes listed on p. 404 above, who take a stand against an unwelcome suitor and find themselves involved in a war as a result (8). However, even in this group Latinus is unusual, for he himself takes little action against his unwanted son-in-law. Although he opposes Turnus' suit, his attempts to prevent Turnus from marrying Lavinia are feeble and ineffective. Indeed, before Eneas' arrival, Latinus had allowed his wife to persuade him, against his better judgment, to betroth Turnus to Lavinia (3230 ff). Having changed his mind and promised Lavinia to Eneas, in accordance with what he knows is the gods' will, Latinus is powerless to enforce his decision or to combat Turnus' claim; he simply retires from the argument, leaving the rivals to fight it out, and provoking the queen's scornful comment:

3446      Li rois est vials, tot a guerpi;  
             Qui que face desmesurance,  
             N'an baillera escu ne lance.

---

(8) It should be pointed out that, in the case of Latinus as well as in that of most of the other fathers who similarly share their daughters' point of view, the rejected suitor is personally unwelcome to the father himself, often for political reasons; fathers do not fight off potential sons-in-law simply in order to humour a choosy daughter.

Latimus' rather fatalistic attitude to his daughter's marriage is derived from Virgil, and it seems possible that the classical mould did not fit medieval preconceptions about parental behaviour, for the idea was seldom used in later examples of the "unwanted suitor" theme. Fathers in such episodes, whether they approve of the suitor or dislike him, tend usually to be forceful characters determined to have their own way. Even king Phelippe, the father of Romadanaple in Florimont, who is in many ways the closest parallel to Latinus, differs sharply from him in the energy with which he rebuffs the high-handed proposals of Camdiobras (Florimont lines 1309 ff).

In Eneas, then, we have a heroine who finds one of her suitors unwelcome. Her objections spring entirely from the fact that she is in love with a different man, and not from any intrinsic unsuitability of the rejected candidate for her hand. Her rejection of the unwanted suitor is total; she is prepared to die rather than marry him. These reactions are reasonably common in heroines faced by unwelcome suitors, and the development in which the rejected suitor makes war on the girl's father is also frequently met with. Lavinia's situation, however, contains a feature which is comparatively unusual, in the "reversed" roles of her parents; her mother champions the unwelcome suitor in a very forceful way, while her father opposes him but is very ineffectual. This particular combination of parental attitudes

to a daughter's marriage is not often encountered in the romances we are concerned with.

Another romance in which the rejected suitor is, seen objectively, a not undesirable husband, is Amadas et Ydoine. The situation of Ydoine, however, is in other ways very different from that of Lavinia. As we have already mentioned, she is one of the few unfortunates among our heroines who is actually married to the unwelcome suitor, and she is forced into this match by her father. Her reactions to the unwanted suitor are, however, very similar to Lavinia's, as we shall see.

Ydoine loathes the idea of marrying the count of Nevers because she is already in love with Amadas, and wants to marry him. The personal attributes of the count play no part in turning Ydoine against him; the fact that she will be separated from Amadas is enough in itself to make her detest the idea of being another man's wife. Indeed, she seems to have few personal feelings about the count one way or the other; it is the marriage itself she fears, and the personal qualities of her husband are a matter of indifference to her. As it happens, the count is not unattractive, and is both nobly born and of an accommodating disposition (9), but Ydoine cares as little as Lavinia

---

(9) J.R.Reinhard, in his book The Old French Romance of Amadas et Ydoine, (North Carolina 1927) p.163, gives a flattering picture of the character of Ydoine's "gallant" husband. M. D. Legge, on the other hand, finds the count "a ridiculous nonentity", whose complaisance towards his wife is "too good to be true" (Anglo-Norman Literature and its Background, Oxford 1963, p.112). My own reading of the text confirms Reinhard's rather than Legge's interpretation; the author stresses the count's courage (lines 2248, 2317-8, 3230-1) and his genuine love for Ydoine (2334-5), and shows him treating his near-hysterical bride with tenderness and concern (2363-2429).

for the possibility that her unwanted suitor might in fact make a good husband. However, she has rather more reason than Lavinia to take such an absolute stand. The man she loves is not an unknown and possibly uncaring newcomer, like Eneas, but her squire Amadas, who has given ample proof of his love for her and to whom she is secretly betrothed. Thus she has good reason to look on the unloved suitor with horror, for marriage to him will destroy a concrete prospect of happiness, not just an unlikely dream.

Like Lavinia, Ydoine at first sees suicide as the way out of her desperate plight; after her forced betrothal, she is:

1989                      ...si fort adolee  
                          Quant d'Amadas est desevree,  
                          Que volontiers se fust ocise.

However, she also takes more positive steps to prevent the count from marrying her, and to preserve herself "pucele et pure" (1995) for Amadas: she hires three witches, at great expense, to frighten him out of the project (2007 ff). It is clear that the witches' commission is, in fact, to prevent the marriage from taking place at all, and not simply to preserve Ydoine's purity within her marriage; Ydoine's goal is marriage to Amadas, and in order to achieve that goal she must at all costs avoid being made the wife of another man. Ydoine's momentary glimpse of success shows clearly that her aim was to prevent the marriage:

2311 Ydoine en a joie mult grant,  
 Que bien quide que par itant  
 Remaine qu'il mais ne la pregne  
 Et qu'Amadas l'ait sans calenge.

Indeed, she is so preoccupied with this aim that she does not, apparently, stop to think what she will do if the plan fails. She has no project of keeping up her liaison with Amadas while she is married to someone else, and her success in evading the consummation of the match is almost accidental, and can in no way be seen as a deliberately planned result of the witches' threats. She has pinned all her hopes so firmly on the count's withdrawal from the engagement that the wedding-day finds her utterly at a loss, too distraught to be capable of any considered attempt at self-protection (2340-62). She sees the wedding as a disaster, and puts all her energy into preventing it from taking place; the idea of finding a compromise solution, and keeping Amadas at least as a lover, is completely foreign to her (10). She is desevree from Amadas by being pledged to another, and no compromise seems possible.

Yet, despite her sense that this marriage is a disaster, Ydoine feels incapable of open opposition to her father. She seeks a devious way out of her predicament, and at no stage does she consider it possible to rebel openly against her father's will.

---

(10) As Miss Barrow points out in Medieval Society Romances, p.40, this refusal to contemplate adultery as a solution to the problem of the loveless marriage is characteristic of both heroes and heroines in the "marital" romances.



We feel that the weight of paternal authority was too heavy for a young girl to contemplate opposing it; a good match has been arranged for her, and she would be thought almost criminally perverse if she objected to it. Obviously Ydoine's timidity at this point is dictated by the needs of the plot; but at the same time, it is perfectly realistic that a daughter should thus accept her father's wishes in the matter of her marriage as an immutable law, even though there was, in fact, legal support for her rejection of such an exercise of paternal authority. The doctrine that the free consent of the contracting partners was essential to a marriage had been incorporated into the matrimonial law of the Church since the middle of the twelfth century; the Church's absolute jurisdiction in all matters relating to the sacrament of marriage was also firmly established by this period (11). Yet many surviving records show that the influence of the ancient custom of treating parental consent as a vital element of a marriage-contract was slow in waning, and that the head of the family frequently used his authority to oblige his children, and particularly his daughters, to marry in accordance with his own wishes (12). A daughter had small means of defence: she was

---

(11) On these points, see Part II above, pp.53 and note 16 (establishment of Church jurisdiction) and pp.72-4 (triumph of consensualism).

(12) Many instances of marriages in which the parents' consent is of far greater importance than that of the often unwilling partners in the marriage are given by Juliette Turlan in her well-documented article "Recherches sur le mariage dans la pratique coutumière", Revue Historique de Droit Français et Etranger, XXXV (1957) pp.477-528.

legally subjected to the head of her family, whether father or brother, by his right of mainburnie over her, which institutionalised her naturally dependent position, and made any rebellion seem doubly difficult. Thus, although a marriage forced on a daughter against her will had no legal validity, in practice it was reasonably easy for a father to coerce his daughter into such a match. The weight of past tradition and present convention upheld the father's authority, and the Church, the only power capable of championing a daughter's cause effectively, was more than likely to be represented on the spot by a man as deeply imbued with the sense of tradition and convention as any other (13).

Thus it is not surprising that Ydoine should be portrayed as a girl who, though naturally courageous, shrinks from opposing her father's plans for her marriage. The same daughterly respect can be seen in other heroines whose fathers arrange for them to marry against their will (14). The only heroines who dare express

---

(13) The rôle of the chaplain of the Count of Limors in Erec et Enide provides a good example of a member of the clergy who appears to have no scruples about performing a forced marriage. Chrétien does not make it clear whether this man is simply ignorant, or so much under the sway of his lay patron, the bullying count, that he dares not speak out about the need for consent. Whatever the chaplain's motives, however, the fact remains that Chrétien found it apparently realistic and credible that he should officiate in the union even though Enide "molt le refusa" (lines 4724-35).

(14) Apart from Blonde and Fenice, whose reactions to paternal pressure are described here, such timidity is also shown by Melior, heroine of Guillaume de Palerne, who finds it easier to run away disguised as a bear than to tell her father she does not want to marry the Greek lord he has chosen, and by the heroines of Marie's Deus Amanz, of L'Escoufle, and of Floriant, none of whom dares tell her father that she wants to marry a man of whom he disapproves.

their feelings with some openness are Galeron, who in fact does not have to contend with a father but with a loving and "foible" brother, Felice in Guy de Warewic, and the shameless heroine of Cristal et Clarie.

However, although Ydoine's obedience to her father is not unusual, there remain certain other features about her marriage with the count of Nevers which need explanation. One may ask, for example, why she does not refuse the count during the wedding ceremony itself? We learn later that she is well aware that the marriage is invalidated by the lack of her consent, and she hopes to use this as grounds for having the union annulled through the impediment of vis (lines 3720-2). Why, then, does she not express her refusal at the crucial moment, during the responses before the priest? It seems that the author of Amadas himself was somewhat embarrassed by the inconsistency of Ydoine's allowing the wedding to proceed, for we find that he circumvents the difficulty by suggesting that his heroine is unconscious during the wedding service. Ydoine faints before the ceremony (2342-3) and is carried away fainting after it (2354-8); the implication is that she is perhaps only semi-conscious during the service, and unable to think or act coherently.

Again, the annulment of Ydoine's marriage, and the part played in this process by the non-consummation of the union and by the intervention of the three witches, raises some legal points

which deserve discussion. In considering the grounds for her annulment, Ydoine does not at any point refer to the non-consummation of the match as one of them. In this she is, of course, perfectly in accordance with canon law. Non-consummation did not nullify a marriage, since the marriage was formed by consent alone, and not by the copula. The marriage of Joseph and the Virgin Mary was held to be perfect, though it was unconsummated, as we have pointed out on p.74 above.

However, the non-consummation in Ydoine's case might be considered to be due to impotence, which would indeed nullify the union. As we have shown in pp.110-111 above, it was accepted in canon law that women might be impotent, and that this impotence might arise from an incurable illness. This is precisely what happens to Ydoine: on her marriage to the count, she falls into a state of such weakness that he is unable to consummate the match (2342-2448), and her malady, which we might nowadays consider psychosomatic, brings her almost to death's door (2549-65, 2931-2947). An annulment on these grounds, however, would not serve Ydoine's purpose, since, having been declared impotent, she would then be legally incapable of contracting any marriage at all; and if her impotence was cured, her original marriage to the count would be restored.

The situation, however, has further complexities. There is also a suggestion that the count himself is rendered mentally, though not physically, impotent, as a result of his belief in the

malediction of the three witches hired by Ydoine. The witches trick the count with a false prophecy that he will die if he deflowers this particular girl (2061-2302); as we have seen, their objective is to frighten the count out of marrying Ydoine at all, and not simply out of consummating the match. However, they and Ydoine reckon without the count's courage, which inspires him to go through with the wedding in defiance of their dire predictions. Nevertheless, he is half-convinced, and when it comes to the wedding night his own fears keep him from lying with his bride, a deed he would otherwise have accomplished in spite of Ydoine's malady, tears and resistance (2342-50, 2363-78, 2430-40) (15).

Impotence of this kind, caused by a magic spell, was also grounds for an annulment at this period, as we have pointed out on p.111 above. Ydoine, of course, as the instigator of the magic, could hardly advance such a plea, though it would be open to the count to do so. Yet a third possible application of the impediment of impotence is suggested by the "enchantment" of Ydoine's three witches. Pretending to be "Destinees" (i.e. the three Fates), they declare that they have doomed Ydoine never to know carnal pleasure (2170-88). Although this "doom" is a complete fabrication, it raises the possibility that Ydoine herself might claim to be made impotent through a magic spell. Since the

---

(15) Reinhard suggests the legend of St Cecilia as a source for Ydoine's wedding-night resistance: op.cit. p.75. I have been unable to trace the reference to §2 of his own work given here.

impotence is supposed to be lifelong, and would therefore dirimate any marriage Ydoine might make with Amadas, she cannot very well pursue this possibility in an ecclesiastical court; but she does later use her "predestined impotence" privately, in order to convince her husband that they must separate.

Since the impediment of impotence was notoriously controversial, and difficult to prove, it is scarcely surprising that the author of Amadas does not take the matter further, nor spend time on the legal implications of the non-consummation of the marriage. In any case, he may well have been unaware of some of the canonical provisions regarding impotence, although it seems likely that he knew that impotence, rather than non-consummation, was the key issue. As we have remarked, he makes use of Ydoine's alleged impotence, and the resulting non-consummation, in the discussions which lead to the eventual separation of Ydoine and her husband.

As we shall see, it is important that Ydoine's husband should agree to this separation, and should, indeed, desire it. The author therefore shows Ydoine exploiting the witches' false prediction, and the very real non-consummation, to convince the count that he would be much better off if he separated from her and married someone else. The witches, Ydoine tells her husband,

7223	...vous mandent que nul deport N'avrés de moi ne nul confort Ne je tout autresi de vous; Partir nous convient a estrous;
7227	De cele que vous puis prendrois Joie et confort tous jors avrois.

By these arguments, Ydoine is able to manoeuvre the count into himself suggesting that the marriage should be annulled (lines 7269-86) (16).

Nevertheless, as we have already pointed out (above, pp. 192-3), the annulment is not pronounced on the grounds of impotence, nor on those of force and fear (vis et metus, which of course is the true impediment in this case). Instead, a trumped-up consanguinity is alleged. Indeed, the author has little interest in the exact nature of the pretext employed, and simply remarks casually that the annulment is granted "soit par parage u par el" (7347). Evidently, the author of Amadas was well aware that such cases were, indeed, often settled on a legal fiction, and moreover that the fiction most commonly resorted to was that of kinship (17).

(16) Like several other heroines, Ydoine is most reluctant to appear to take the initiative in any of the arrangements connected with her own marriage. Similarly, Laudine and Melior of Byzantium appear to bow to the will of their respective vassals rather than to follow their own wishes. In the Arsenal ms. of Partonopeus, Melior's sister comments explicitly on the wisdom of thus marrying par conseil and not par soi:

Dame qui par soi se marie,  
On li atorne a vilonie,  
Et quant ele s'est mesmarie,  
Molt en est en mal escriee;  
Et s'il l'en sort desconvenue,  
Tos li mondes l'en blasme et hme;  
Mais vos ne faites pas issi,  
Par haut conseil prendrés mari...  
Or i pert que ne querés mie  
Mariage de drüerie.

(Gildea ed., Appendix I, lines 461-474).

(17) G. Duby calls attention to several examples of kings and great nobles who got their marriages annulled through more or less spurious charges of one or other of the two kinds of kinship, consanguinity and affinity; see Medieval Marriage, pp. 55, 64 and 75 ff.

It is, perhaps, as a reflection of this slightly cynical attitude to the decisions of Church courts that the author of Amadas devotes so little space to the Church's part in the annulment proceedings. The entire process is despatched in six lines :

7342      Au jor qu'il assisent mult pres  
              Eveskes font venir assés  
              Et autres gens, clers et letrés,  
              Qui les ont par crestienté  
 7346      Partis tout a leur volenté,  
              Soit par parage ou par el.

In contrast, the poet takes nearly 250 lines (7101-7341) to show exactly how the important laymen concerned — Ydoine's husband and her father, and even her future vassals — are brought to agree to the dissolution of the marriage.

Religion does, admittedly, play a rôle in this process, but the religious element is pagan and superstitious rather than Christian, and the author's handling of it shows scant respect for the Church and her laws. Rather, it illustrates Reinhard's statement that at this period, "religious faith ... was ... unable to uproot superstition" (18). We have already commented on the way in which Ydoine uses the witches' prediction to manipulate her husband into asking for a separation. Looking at this scene more closely, we find that Ydoine is in fact giving her witches a spurious air of divine messengers. She has, she says, been to

---

(18) Op.cit., p.160. Reinhard does not comment specifically on the incident discussed here, however.



Rome and seen a vision of St Peter, who introduced three women to her as the three Fates (the witches had called themselves Cloto, Lachesis and Atropos when hoodwinking the count with their false prophecy). With this holy preamble, Ydoine then repeats the substance of the witches' original malediction. The "destiny" which prevents the consummation of the marriage thus appears as a divine predestination; dissolving the marriage must, therefore, be in accordance with the Church's will (19). Such, it seems, is the spurious reasoning with which Ydoine convinces her husband that he would be right to seek an annulment. Needless to say, the divine sanction thus given to the case is entirely Ydoine's invention, and her exploitation of St Peter brings the Church down to the superstitious level of the witches and their supposed curse.

In the subsequent proceedings, no further reference is made to this alleged "divine authority" for the annulment. No-one, apparently, thinks it necessary to verify Ydoine's statement that she had seen a vision in Rome. Indeed, the vision is no longer mentioned; all that survives is the "necessity" (estavoir) of dissolving the marriage. This necessity, moreover, appears to

---

(19) It is unfortunately beyond the scope of this thesis to discuss the theological background — if any — of this scene, in which the three Fates are presented as personages as "real" as St Peter, and having power over all human destiny (7165-9), yet subservient to God's will as expressed through the apostle (7184-8).

spring as much from the witches' curse as from St Peter, so that the Christian element, which in any case has nothing to do with contemporary canon law, recedes still further into the background.

On this religious basis, such as it is, Ydoine sets about winning her husband and father over to her side. Evidently, the author regarded this task as far more difficult than that of winning the consent of the Church, and he exclaims in amazement at his heroine's feminine duplicity and skill in manipulating men to her will (7037-97, 7348-52). Moreover, as we have remarked, he gives a detailed description of the way Ydoine wins the consent of these feudal lords, indicating that he considered the process an important one, and one which needed careful explanation.

Once Ydoine has won over the count of Nevers, the next stage in the process is for the husband and wife, now acting together on the count's decision to separate, to send for Ydoine's father, who arranged their original marriage. It is this man, the duke of Burgundy, who appears to have the right to make the final decision in the matter. He arrives with his closest advisers, who are not churchmen, but his best and most important vassals. This group of feudal lords then holds a privy council, at which the reasons for requiring the separation are explained to the duke. It is the duke, we find, who is expected to choose the grounds on which the annulment shall be sought:

7303 L'endemain ont au due mostré...  
 7309 ...que partir par estavoir  
 Les estuet : ne puet remanoir.  
 Or si esgart a son avis  
 Avec ses plus privés amis  
 7313 la raison qui mix i affiert,  
 Si com la matere requiert.

The emphasis on the duke as one of the chief actors in his daughter's annulment continues as the author explains that the duke is delighted to have the opportunity of bringing about the separation, since he feared that he would lose his only daughter through this marriage, which had proved so disastrous for her health. Indeed, we learn that the duke had wanted to act in the matter for some time:

7322 Pieç'a ques vausist departir  
 Mult volentiers, se il seüst  
 Comfaitement estre peüst  
 Par conscience et par raison.  
 7326 Or i a raisnavle ocoison,  
 Quant de cascade part se doelent.

Two points are worth noting here. Firstly, as we have indicated, it is clearly up to the duke to unmake this marriage, just as he had made it in the first place; all he lacks is reasonable grounds for his intervention. Secondly, these grounds are not provided by any canonical impediment, but by the desire of both partners to free themselves from the marriage. Since we have already heard at length how much Ydoine wanted to be free, it is evident that the missing occoison was the count's desire for a separation. Only when his son-in-law, as well as Ydoine, complains of the marriage

does the duke feel able to take action. The importance of the count's consent is further brought out in the next few lines, where the author gives us yet another reason why Ydoine's husband should want to be rid of her; he has fallen in love with an eligible girl, the pretty daughter of the count of Poitiers (7332-5). This is the first we have heard of the count's new love, and it seems clear that the author included this detail here solely in order to show how fully Ydoine's husband shared her wish for an annulment. The count's desire for a separation, then, is a key factor, and certainly appears to be more important, and more difficult to obtain, than the Church's permission. Nevertheless, the most essential element is the consent of the senior nobleman and head of the lineage, the duke of Burgundy. Even though Ydoine's husband wishes for a separation, he dares not take the initiative that would free him for a new marriage until Ydoine's "vision" has given him good grounds; and what holds him back is not fear of Church censure, but fear of the duke :

7336 D'Ydoine fust mult volentiers  
Partis, se pour le duc osast.

The final step is for all the lay people involved, who are now agreed on a separation (7341), to send for the bishops and clerks to carry it out. One cannot help noticing that the churchmen appear to be summoned ("Eveskes font venir", line 7343) by the feudal lords to do what the lords require; the "tout a leur volenté"

of line 7346 is as important as the "par crestienté" of line 7345. Indeed, the rôle of the Church court seems almost to consist of little more (if one may be forgiven an anachronistic expression) than providing the rubber stamp for the lords' decision.

In sum, the author of Amadas clearly knew that the Church's participation in the annulment proceedings was essential. Nevertheless, he treats the Church's assent as a point which can easily be gained. Indeed, it can be simply fabricated at need, as with Ydoine's story of St Peter; or, where realistic bishops are required, they appear to be only too happy to agree to a false indictment in order to satisfy great nobles like the duke of Burgundy. But it is the consent of these nobles which really decides the matter, and this is the point which can only be won with difficulty, through tortuous manoeuvre.

It is possible that the author's picture of the ease with which Church consent is obtained springs from simple ignorance of the processes of canon law. Certainly Ydoine's "vision", in which religion appears as part of the semi-magical, fantastic element in the romance, contrasts with the very realistic way in which the negotiations with the duke are described, and indicates that the author knew far more about lay society than he did about the Church. Nevertheless, such ignorance would itself be an indication of the small impact which the Church's laws and procedures made on the mind even of an educated man like our author. On the whole, I am

inclined to accept his picture of the dominance of feudal interests over Church ones in the pronouncing of Ydoine's annulment as a fairly realistic reflection of the freedom of great lords from Church control, or at least of the freedom they had often enjoyed in the centuries before his own (20).

Our analysis of Ydoine's annulment has led us some way from our consideration of her initial attitude to her loveless marriage. It may therefore be helpful at this point to remind ourselves of that earlier attitude, since we shall be comparing it with that of other heroines in similar situations. Ydoine, then, sees marriage to an unwelcome suitor as the death of all her hopes. Her situation is the not uncommon one of a girl forced into marriage by her father, and she reacts to it by a desperate attempt to discourage the unwanted suitor from proceeding with the marriage. She sees the marriage-contract itself as the great threat to her happiness, ignoring the personal attributes of the proposed husband, and leaving the question of her relationship with her lover once she has been married to another man to be solved when it arises - though she devoutly hopes it never will. In particular, she forms no plan to prevent

---

(20) See, for example, the rôle of the French bishops in Philip I's repudiation of his first wife and subsequent marriage to Bertrade, the wife of Fulk of Anjou, at the end of the eleventh century. As Duby shows (Medieval Marriage pp.29-41), most of the clergy in France supported Philip in his bigamous marriage, and the Council of Poitiers, which tried to condemn it, was dispersed by Philip's vassal, William of Aquitaine.

the consummation of her marriage, and the non-consummation is simply a fortuitous result of her plot to prevent the marriage from taking place at all.

As a point of comparison with Amadas, it is interesting to look at Jehan et Blonde, which resembles the earlier romance in several ways. Blonde, having fallen in love with her squire and become secretly betrothed to him, is promised during his absence to another man by her father. Her situation is thus identical with that of Ydoine, except for the fact that she has a definite rendezvous with her lover. It is this difference which enables Blonde to avoid Ydoine's fate, for Jehan, unlike Amadas, is on hand to carry off his darling before she can be forcibly married to another man. Blonde herself, like Ydoine, seeks an indirect way out of the hated marriage, and dares not tell her father that she does not want to marry the husband he has chosen; as Miss Barrow comments, she cannot envisage a protest because her father "is so distinctly within his rights here that she does not dare confess to a previous engagement with a young man of inferior rank and fortune." (21). Like both Ydoine and Lavinia, Blonde seems indifferent to the personal qualities of the unwelcome suitor, and although he is in fact stupid and boorish, she has only one fault to find with him : he is not Jehan. Another familiar aspect of Blonde's attitude is her refusal to compromise.

---

(21) Op.cit., p.41.

Although she does not go so far as to envisage the sin of suicide, she sees no possibility of reconciling her love for Jehan with marriage to another man. Such a compromise would be foreign to her idealistic nature.

However, there is one very significant difference between Blonde's reaction to her situation and that of Ydoine. Where Ydoine turns to fundamentally pagan solutions like suicide and witchcraft, Blonde sees the Church's law as her salvation. She does not dare reveal her feelings to her father; but she thinks that, in the presence of the priest who is to officiate at her wedding, it will be possible for her to make it plain that she does not consent to the match (2916 ff). Such a declaration, with its attendant scandal, is abhorrent to her sense of decency; but she is prepared to make it, for Jehan's sake, and expects it to succeed. Whether this reliance on a legal solution is to be attributed to Beaumanoir's own training and personality, or whether it is a sign of a general growth in awareness of the Church's view in the seventy-five or so years which separate Amadas from Jehan et Blonde, is open to question; personally I would attach more importance to the different aims and characters of the two authors themselves than to any differences in knowledge in the public at large. As I have already pointed out, the author of Amadas knew quite enough canon law to realise that Ydoine would be able to have her marriage annulled because she had not freely consented to it; if he does not make her refuse the count of Nevers in church, it is partly because he wanted to follow the



pattern laid down by Tristan and Cligès, and partly because of a tendency to prefer the fantastic event (witchcraft, madness) to the "real-life" situations envisaged by Beaumanoir (refusal at the altar, elopement).

Blonde's determination that any husband but the man she loves must be totally unacceptable, and her inability to explain this to her father, are both aspects which can be said to be typical of heroines in her situation. Her reliance on canon law to save her from an unwanted marriage is less frequently met with, but not unique; Enide's unsuccessful refusal of the count of Limors and Rose of Poitiers' refusal of Harpin (Le Conte de Poitiers 973-990) are instances of a similar reliance on the doctrine that no-one can be married against their will, though in different circumstances. Moreover, Ydoine herself thinks of canon law as one way of getting out of her marriage, even though she did not rely on it to save her from the match in the first place.

Like our two previous heroines, Chrétien's Fenice is betrothed by her father to a man other than the man she loves. Although her attitude to Alis himself is very much what we have come to expect, her attitude to marrying him is unusual, as a comparison with the heroines we have already discussed will show.

Fenice resembles Lavinia in that it is not until she has fallen in love with another man that she begins to object to the

husband her father has selected for her. We learn nothing about her feelings for either Alis or the duke of Saxony until she has fallen in love with Cligès. She appears simply as a dutiful daughter, hastening to obey her father's summons to meet her future husband (2673-6, 2706-8), and with no views worth mentioning on the prospect of marriage. It is not until after her love for Cligès has been confirmed by the revelation of his military prowess and by the discovery of his identity that Alis becomes an unwelcome suitor, "Celui qui pleire ne li puet" (2948). Thus Fenice's chief objection to Alis is that she does not love him, but loves his nephew and rightful heir instead.

The importance of Fenice's love for Cligès in determining her attitude to Alis can further be seen in her neglect of the other defects which might make Alis an unacceptable suitor. Unlike Turmus or the count of Nevers, Alis himself has unattractive qualities which, independently of her feelings for another man, might well make a young girl dislike the idea of marrying him. In the first place, he is considerably older than Fenice; and in the second place, he is disloyal, and has broken the oath he made to his brother. Yet the disparity of age does not seem to weigh with Fenice, who makes no reference to it; and her objections to Alis' lack of faith are provoked entirely by her love for Cligès, who will suffer through his uncle's disloyalty (3133-47), and of whose misfortune she will be the instrument (3148-55). It is not because of his treacherous nature that she finds Alis objectionable, but because the victim of his treachery is Cligès; her estimate of

Alis' vice is reflected through her love for his nephew, and she does not think of its general effects, nor of the effect it may have on her as his wife.

Thus Alis is an unwelcome husband for Fenice because she loves Cligès, who is his nephew and who will be disinherited by the marriage, if she has children. Her distress is not caused simply by the fact that her heart cannot follow her hand, but by the additional complication of the relationship between Cligès and Alis, and the threat to Cligès' inheritance. Stating her problem, she does not say that the trouble is that she loves one man and must marry another, but that she is at her wits' end because:

3100                   ...cil qui m'atalante  
Est niés celui que prendre doi.

Nevertheless, Fenice makes no attempt to go against her father. Indeed, she dares not: "Je ne li os contredire" (3129). Most of the time, the very idea of resistance seems to be beyond her; she accepts her father's wish as an immutable law, which she is powerless to alter. She does not want to marry Alis, but she must:

2947           Mes par force avoir li estuet  
Celui qui pleire ne li puet.

This feeling that it is impossible to oppose a father in such a matter is, by now, familiar to us. Of course, Chrétien made his

heroine fear her father because he wanted to follow the Tristan, just as the author of Amadas set out to follow Cligès, but this does not alter the basic realism of such a portrayal. Chrétien may have "invented" the defenceless daughter, in the sense that he was perhaps the first to introduce her into a romance, but he was copying from life, not inventing an improbable character.

Yet in one respect the submissiveness of Fenice is almost unique; she makes no attempt, even by trickery, to evade the hateful marriage. Indeed, she seems to agree quite happily to becoming the wife of Alis, provided that she can prevent the marriage from being consummated. Significantly, the possibility of her refusing Alis in church is not even raised. There are very few other heroines in our romances who thus agree without a struggle to go through a marriage ceremony with a man other than the one they love. Ydoine, as we have seen, goes to extraordinary lengths to prevent her marriage from taking place; Blonde, more down-to-earth, tries to escape the wedding she dreads by postponing it until after the day of her appointment with Jehan. Even if this fails, she is determined that the words of consent which would make her the wife of another man will never pass her lips. Galeron, at the mere suspicion that her brother is about to marry her to a husband she does not want, declares firmly that she would rather be burnt alive (Ille et Galeron, Paris version, 1447-9). The father of Melior, heroine of Guillaume de Palerne, wants her to marry a Greek prince; rather than become the wife of

another man, she runs away with the foundling Guillaume to live a potentially comfortless life in the forest (lines 2680-6; 2852 ff). The father of Joie wants to force her into a union more repugnant than any of these, for he seeks to marry her himself; Joie is so determined to avoid an incestuous marriage that she cuts off her hand rather than go through with it (La Manekine 609-798).

All these heroines are determined to avoid, if they can, being married to the unwelcome suitors found for them by father or brother, and all of them take some sort of deliberate step to avoid the marriage, whether by open defiance or by more indirect means. All of them see the marriage-contract itself as the threat; none of them is prepared, like Fenice, to regard the contract as an innocuous formula provided that one of its terms can be left unfulfilled. Thus Fenice is almost alone in her readiness to marry an unwelcome suitor, under certain conditions. One of Marie's heroines is, perhaps, as passive: Milun's mistress, who, though she dreads the thought of marrying the man chosen by her father, does nothing to hinder the match (Lais, Milun 126-152). Otherwise, the attitude of Fenice is unique in the romances under consideration here.

Of course, Fenice does not agree altogether calmly to her father's plans. She hopes to be able to remain Alis' wife in name only, and it is the assurance that this will be possible which reconciles her to the wedding itself. Nevertheless, it is noticeable that she does not ask Thessala to help her evade the

wedding at any stage; when she reveals her secret to her nurse, it is with the intention of finding a way of evading the consummation of the match, not the match itself. In her predicament, her first reaction is to thwart Alis, not to thwart her father; for her, the threat is not the marriage-contract, but its consequences, and it is on these that she concentrates her efforts. No doubt it was largely because he wanted to follow the pattern laid down by Iseut that Chrétien made Fenice react in this way - Iseut who, as far as we know, made little effort to avoid being married to Mark, but concentrated her attention instead on avoiding her husband's attentions on the wedding night.

However, Chrétien's aim was not simply to retell Iseut's story with different characters, but to produce a "version revue et corrigée" in which the "message" of the story would be transformed (22). Taking from the Tristan the situation of a girl who passively agrees to marry her lover's uncle, but thwarts his expectations on the wedding-night, Chrétien transforms the heroine's motives and intentions, and turns the passionate, selfish, amoral Iseut into a thoughtful and selfless girl who is determined to abide by her personal conception of morality. Whether or not Fenice herself will ever benefit from the dangerous deception of

---

(22) J. Frappier, Chrétien de Troyes (Paris 1968), p.106. Frappier's clear, concise analysis of the relationship between Cligès and the Tristan on pp.105-6 of this book seems to me to strike exactly the right balance, and deserves to be seen as the best summary of this particular question.

Alis is uncertain; she does not know that Cligès loves her, and though she hopes, wistfully, that he will be moved if he learns of her efforts on his behalf, and wants also to leave the way open for a possible fulfilment of her love for him, these are imponderable future benefits, and, not the immediate spurs to her resolve. In seeking to defraud Alis of his rights, she is concerned with protecting Cligès himself from Alis' plan to disinherit him, and she is activated also by a certain moral delicacy which makes her shrink from the ignoble partage to which Iseut lent herself. Thus her deception of her husband is far from being a cunning way of furthering an adulterous relationship, as it is with Iseut; it springs both from a selfless concern for the object of her love, and from a certain moral code, which may be unorthodox but is none the less idealistic.

Fenice, then, is more than just a counterbalance to Iseut; she is a fully-developed character in her own right, and her reactions are perfectly explicable in terms of her own personality and situation. Her passive acceptance of her father's wishes can be seen as the fruit of her timidity and her shrinking from an open conflict, with the ensuing scandal; and, still more important, as the consequence of her ignorance about Cligès' own feelings. Attempted resistance to a father's plans is made worthwhile for Ydoine and Blonde, because they are certain of

being rewarded by marriage with the man they love; but for Fenice, union of any kind with Cligès is an extremely remote and uncertain prospect, and it is perfectly understandable that, with everything to lose and nothing to be certainly won, she should feel herself unable to brave her father's wrath and the gossip of every court in Europe. But the timid Fenice is also capable of great devotion, both to the man she loves and to her personal code of honour, and the combination of these qualities, as we have seen, is enough in itself to explain her decision to avoid the consummation of her marriage. Nevertheless, it should not be forgotten that Fenice is indeed exceptional; and she is exceptional because, as we saw in the previous chapter, she does not set her sights on marriage to the man she loves. This frees her from the view, taken by so many other heroines, that marriage to anyone but the man one loves is a disaster; her promise to be the wife of Alis does not seem important to Fenice, because she has no particular interest in becoming the wife of Cligès.

Having examined the canonical problems raised by Ydoine's loveless marriage, we cannot leave Fenice without stopping to consider where she, too, stands in regard to canon law. This question has already attracted the attention of scholars, notably A. Fourrier and R. Guette. Fourrier, as we have already remarked (above, p.49 and p.158, note 1), sees Fenice's situation as an example of the thorny problem of the sponsa duorum (23). However,

---

(23) Le Courant Réaliste (Paris 1960), p.176.



the case is probably more complex even than that outlined by Fourrier : "Un premier mariage non consommé en autorise-t-il un second scellé par la carnalis copulatio? Laquelle des deux unions doit être maintenue? A qui appartient la femme?" (loc. cit.). This statement of the case assumes that the two men of whom Fenice is the sponsa are Alis and Cligès; but a contemporary canonist would almost certainly say that, if Fenice is a sponsa duorum, it is because of the rival claims of Alis and the duke of Saxony.

Chrétien does not tell us exactly what promise has been exchanged with the duke of Saxony. Fenice's father tells Alis' messengers that his daughter is promise/to the duke (2634-5), and we learn that the duke is sure enough of his rights to be prepared to take this promised bride by force if necessary (2636-40, 2819-30). Later the duke is described as the man "cui el fu premerains donee" (3337; my italics), with doner apparently having the meaning "given in marriage" which it so often bears in our texts. It thus appears that there has been a desponsatio, or betrothal, and that the duke has every right to expect that the next step, the traductio or handing-over of the bride, will follow in due course. As we have seen, betrothal vows were very binding at this period, and the distinction between a betrothal and an unconsummated marriage was a slight

one (24). Indeed, the situation envisaged here, with a prior promise of marriage being broken in favour of a subsequent marriage-pact which is, as far as is known, consummated, is almost exactly the case of the sponsa duorum as outlined by Fourrier (25). Moreover, as Fourrier points out, the Pope who reigned at the time Cligès was written, Alexander III, would have settled such a case in favour of the first desponsatio (26).

It was, of course, precisely in order to eliminate this kind of confusion that the distinction between betrothal, or matrimonium per verba de futuro, and marriage per verba de praesenti was introduced. In the present case, no-one except the duke of Saxony seems to think that the pact made with him was anything more than a betrothal of this kind, while the union with

---

(24) The distinction between betrothal and marriage made by Peter Lombard did not begin to penetrate the Church as a whole until the 1160s, when it was taken up by Pope Alexander III. Cligès is dated c.1176 by A. Micha and A. Fourrier (CFMA edition, Paris 1968, p.VIII). Even if one accepts C. Luttrell's view that Cligès dates from 1185-7 (The Creation of the First Arthurian Romance, London 1974, p.32), this was still a period during which the Lombard's distinction was being slowly assimilated by the Church. For the laity in general, betrothal was accepted as having considerable legal force throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

(25) Only Fenice and Thessala know that the marriage is unconsummated. For Alis, and for all others concerned, consummation seems to have taken place in the normal manner, after the usual blessing of the bed by the officiating clergy (3288-92).

(26) Fourrier does not give a date for the decision he quotes. If it is from the later years of Alexander's pontificate, after his stay in France in the 1160s, it is likely that the first desponsatio in this case was not a betrothal, but an unconsummated marriage.

Alis is clearly celebrated de praesenti, and therefore invalidates the promise previously made for the future. Nevertheless, Alis' marriage appears tainted at the outset by a double breach of faith. Not only has he forsworn his oath to his brother, a point on which Chrétien insists (2592-2607, 2649-52), but Fenice's father has broken faith on her behalf with the duke of Saxony (27). Neither of these broken pledges invalidates the marriage in law; but both must create a strong impression, in the minds of ordinary laymen imbued with the medieval sense of the importance of an oath, that the marriage is the product of treachery, and that both parties to it are forsworn.

If Fenice, then, is the sponsa of both Alis and the duke of Saxony, is she also the sponsa of both Alis and Cligès? Fourrier assumes that this is so; yet nowhere in the text do we see <sup>an</sup> explicit marriage-pact between Fenice and Cligès. Instead, Fenice gives herself to Cligès in an illicit union which, as Fourrier rightly points out, is treated by Chrétien as an act of adultery (28). As we noted in the case of Ydoine, such adultery was often considered to be a "souillure" so grave that it dirimated any subsequent marriage of the guilty parties (29). Even more serious was an

---

(27) One notes that the negotiations throughout are conducted by Fenice's father, who evidently has the right to dispose of his daughter according to his political advantage. On learning of the suit of the Greek emperor, he immediately breaks his pledge to the duke, since the emperor is a far better ally for him (2630-3); there is no question of his consulting Fenice about the arrangement. Moreover, the marriage itself is described by Chrétien as the alliance of the two emperors (3200-2), and not, significantly, as the union of Alis and Fenice.

(28) Op.cit., pp.176-7.

(29) See above, pp. 194-5.

adultery between two people who had promised to marry each other when both were free to do so, for such sexual relations transformed their future promise into the present reality of marriage, and thus incurred the impediment of crimen (30). In view of this threat to their future marriage, it is not surprising that Chrétien does not show us his protagonists making any formal marriage-plans which might appear to be a desponsatio.

All these arguments, however, relate to the forum externum. On this level, which considers only explicit public statements and not inner feelings, Fenice is clearly not the sponsa of Cligès. She has, on the other hand, given public consent to be the wife of Alis, and possibly has earlier given a similar consent to marriage with the duke of Saxony. Of the three, only Alis has received Fenice's explicit consent per verba de praesenti, and he is therefore her lawful husband, whether or not the marriage is consummated.

Robert Guiette, however, has suggested that Cligès might be read according to the forum internum, considering inner desires and not open statements (31). In this light, Fenice's situation appears quite different. Since she did not in her heart consent to be the wife of Alis, her marriage to him is null; whereas her desire to belong entirely to Cligès can be taken as the expression of an inner consent to become his wife, and this consent would become

---

(30) See above, pp. 68-9 and 82-3.

(31) "Sur Quelques vers de Cligès", Romania 91 (1970), pp. 75-83; reprinted in R. Guiette, Questions de Littérature II (Romanica Gandensia XIII, (1972), pp. 45-52. Our page references are all to the Questions de Littérature printing.

a perfect marriage once the copula carnalis had taken place between them. "Fénice se trouverait mariée à Cligès, et ne commettrait en aucune façon l'adultère, puisqu'il n'y aurait pas de partage de son corps entre le mari (légal) et l'amant (mari réel)." (p.49). Indeed, seen from this point of view, Fenice would only be guilty of adultery if she later established conjugal relations with Alis, since her true husband is Cligès. Although none of this is explicitly referred to in the text, it cannot be denied that such a "parallel reading" is possible. Guiette gives a perceptive and thought-provoking analysis of the way in which Chrétien plays with these unspoken possibilities: "Il crée des situations énigmatiques...Il s'est livré à un jeu plein d'ironie et de malice. Il s'est fondé sur le paradoxe, presque comique, d'une donnée courtoise recouvrant des données théologiques ou scolastiques." (p.51).

Guiette also raises the issue of the impediment of impotence produced through a magic spell, which of course applies in Fenice's case as it does in Ydoine's. As Guiette suggests, this impediment adds further complexity to our interpretation of the text. On the "parallel reading" outlined above, Fenice is entirely innocent, since she has no carnal union with anyone but her "real" husband, Cligès. Yet her relations with Alis are not innocent, for she has used a magic spell to make him impotent. As we saw in discussing Ydoine, impotence caused by magic was a recognised cause for the annulment of a marriage;

but the beneficiary in both these cases is clearly the husband, who is free to make another marriage, while the wife who is guilty of such anti-matrimonial practices would normally be refused any subsequent access to the sacrament of marriage, even after the death of her original husband. Thus Fenice's marriage to Cligès might appear to be dirimated by her plot to frustrate the consummation of her marriage to Alis, even though, judged from the forum internum, Alis was not truly her husband.

Nor is this all. Fenice's situation is further complicated by another factor, not noted by Guiette: the fact that Alis and Cligès are uncle and nephew. As a result, her relations with the two men are affected by the impediment of affinity, or rather by that aspect of affinity which later came to be seen as the separate impediment of honestas (32). This impediment dirimated any marriage between one partner in a betrothal or an unconsummated marriage, and a relative of the other partner. Viewed from the forum externum, Fenice is validly married to Alis; her union to Cligès, therefore, can never be anything but an incestuous adultery, even after Alis' death (33). On the other hand, judged by the

---

(32) See above, Part II, pp.96-7, on the impediment of honestas. At the period of Cligès, honestas, which arises from the verbal marriage-contract, was not clearly distinguished from affinity, which arises from physical consummation. Thus, although the impediment itself existed, it was often referred to by the term affinitas, rather than by a separate name. For affinity, see pp.103-8 above.

(33) As Jean Subrenat points out in his article "Sur le Climat Social, Moral, Religieux du Tristan de Béroul", Le Moyen Age 31 (1976) pp.219-261, the marriage of Iseut and Marc is also affected by the impediment of affinity. In this case, Iseut's sexual relations with Tristan would dirimate her subsequent marriage to Tristan's uncle.

forum internum, Fenice is not married Alis, and the impediment therefore does not apply. It is interesting to note that, in the late thirteenth century, this impediment normally operated even in cases where the marriage which gave rise to it was later found to be null, except in the one case of the nullity arising, as it does here, from a lack of consent. Thus the standpoint of the forum internum on this case of affinity is the one which eventually came to predominate in law, which normally judged only on the forum externum (34).

It might be argued, however, that the impediment in this case is not honestas, but affinitas superveniens (see pp.106-7 above). In this case, the situation would appear quite different. Fenice's carnal relations with Cligès would create an affinity between her and Alis which had not existed at the time of their marriage, but which would retrospectively dirimate their union. The non-consummation of the marriage is vital here, for only non-consummated unions could be affected by affinitas superveniens. The impediment was, indeed, one of only two cases in which Alexander III allowed the dissolution of an unconsummated marriage. After the dissolution, the partners were free to remarry, but only after a severe penance for the sin which had created the affinity.

---

(34) The importance of lack of consent as the only cause of nullity which could be admitted in such cases arises from the fact that it was the matrimonial consent itself which created the impediment of honestas. Thus a marriage which was null because of consanguinity, but to which the partners had truly consented, still created the impediment.

In the light of these canonical provisions it is, perhaps, possible to interpret Fenice's treatment at the hands of the Salerno doctors as the equivalent of the penance which purifies her for her union with Cligès.

Chrétien, then, has set an almost insoluble legal problem in Fenice's marriage. Only a twelfth-century jurist could tell us whether she belongs legally to Cligès or Alis, or even to the duke of Saxony, her first sponsus, or indeed whether, after her practice of magic, she is legally capable of marrying anyone at all; and such a jurist would no doubt be hard put to it to disentangle all the different threads of legality and illegality which are interwoven here. Meanwhile a twelfth-century theologian, inclined to consider minds and hearts as well as words and deeds, would come to very different conclusions. Can there be a single, right answer to the puzzle Chrétien has set? Robert Guette thought not, and I would agree with him: "Si les commentateurs d'aujourd'hui peuvent se contredire l'un l'autre, c'est que le roman propose des problèmes et qu'il n'offre pas une solution unique... Peut-être Chrétien se plaisait-il davantage à la complexité de ses jeux qu'à la clarté d'une doctrine!" (art.cit., pp.51-2).

In the stories we have considered so far, the heroine has always had a father who plays a certain rôle in her confrontation with an unwelcome suitor. It is now time to look at some heroines who are no longer under paternal tutelage, and see how they are



affected by the prospect of a loveless marriage.

Melior, the heroine of Partonopeus, has inherited the empire of Byzantium on the death of her father (4573-88). However, she has not thereby become mistress of her own fate; she is still subject to the wishes of her vassals, and it is they who decide that she ought to marry (1345-8). At first, there is no question of an unwelcome suitor; Melior is to be free to choose her own husband (1349-52). It is only after a serious misunderstanding has separated her from the man of her choice, Partonopeus, that Melior is faced with the prospect of having to marry a man whom she cannot love. This unwelcome marriage is to be forced on her by her vassals, anxious to ensure the political stability of the empire (6489-96, 6547-56). They do not, however, present Melior with a particular suitor whom she does not want to marry; her eventual husband may be any one of the hundreds of suitors who assemble for the tournament of which she is to be the prize (6611-36). Thus Melior's problem is different from that of the heroines we have been considering in two respects: she has no father to decide whom she is to marry, and she is not faced by an individual suitor whom she finds unwelcome, but by a no less unwelcome marriage to an unspecified suitor.

Of course, this situation is, fundamentally, very much the same as that faced by Lavinia, Fenice, Ydoine or Blonde. The terms may be different, but the choice is the same: either the man one loves, or some other man whom one does not love. We

have seen how the four heroines examined so far in this chapter tend to ignore the personal attributes of the suitors to whom they object, and to judge them solely in terms of love. With Melior, we see yet more clearly the paramount importance of love in the assessment of a man's suitability as a husband, for any of the candidates proposed by her vassals is automatically unwelcome to her unless he is the one man she loves.

Melior's feelings about the prospect of being forced to marry are first revealed in the course of a conversation with her sister, Urraque (6483-6786). At first, the unhappy empress tries to hide the depth of her distress from her critical sister; she pretends that she no longer cares for Partonopeus, since he has betrayed her (6415-27), and protests that she is more upset at the prospect of having to marry the winner of the tournament than at the idea that Partonopeus is lost to her (6485-7, 6653-8). But in the end, provoked by her sister, Melior shows more and more clearly that she loves Partonopeus, and that any other husband her vassals choose will be anathema to her:

6728	Ja por eals tos un n'en prendrai Fors soul celui ke j'ai amé...
6736	Celui tien ju a mon ami; Que que diront li jugeor, Celui doins je tote m'amor.

The irony of her situation is that, theoretically, it is she who is supposed to choose the victor, on the advice of the seven

judges (6632-4). However, Melior herself clearly feels that this semblance of leaving her the initiative is merely a polite fiction. In any case, she is not interested in exercising any choice she may be allowed, since she cannot have Partonopeus; she prefers to leave the judges to choose their own lord, while remaining passive herself. Her passivity, however, stops short of finally marrying the man they choose :

7096	Ge porrai bien faire semblant De prendre a lor conseil saignor, Mais n'i porrai torner m'amor... Or soit bien li tornoiemens,
7100	U tant doit avoir bones gens, Et je ferai a lor plaisir Et lor lairai saignor choisir. Mais chaus fuz m'arde tot en cendre
7104	Se mais m'i funt nul mari prendre. Parthonopeus est mors por moi; Je l'ai ociz, rendre le doi: Je m'ocirai por soe amor
7108	Ains ke je prengne atre saignor.

Thus Melior, like Lavinia, is prepared to kill herself rather than marry a man she does not love. She sees such a marriage as a betrayal of the memory of Partonopeus, whom she believes dead, and her resolution to die rather than marry is reinforced by the sentiment that she owes such a sacrifice to the lover whose death she has caused.

The desperate nature of this "final solution" suggests that the compulsion exercised by Melior's vassals is as strong as the paternal authority which overwhelms Fenice and Ydoine. Indeed, the Arsenal ms. of Partonopeus suggests that Melior would face

open rebellion if she did not bow to her vassals' will in this matter. Afraid that Melior may not accept the judges' choice of husband, Ernol threatens:

Et se ma dame ne l'otroie,  
 Cascuns de nos aille sa voie,  
 Et garnissons nos fors cités,  
 Nos casteaus et nos fremetés,  
 Encontre li nomeement;  
 Car dont savrons qu'el n'a talent  
 De tenir se terre a honor,  
 Et s'ert criée de folor.

(Gildea ed., Appendix I,  
 lines 427-434).

Melior, it appears, has little hope of thwarting her vassals' will by any means other than warfare or suicide (35). As Urraque points out, her idea of persuading her vassals to change their minds is unlikely to succeed (6743-50); if she was not in a strong enough position to veto the plan at the outset, she certainly is not strong enough to take back her original consent. In any case, as Melior acknowledges, it is already too late; the date of the tournament is so close that it is impossible to put it off (6751-4, 6977-81). The tournament, then, will be held whether Melior wants it or not.

---

(35) As I know of no historical case in which a young girl was left as sole mistress of a domain, with neither overlord nor father to arrange her marriage, it is difficult to say exactly what the powers of vassals would be in such a case. Literature, however, shows us male rulers (Gurun in Marie's Fresne, Galeran and Conrad) who are obliged to give way to their vassals over their choice of a spouse, and we may assume that a woman ruler would be under even greater pressure to follow her vassals' wishes.

If preventing the tournament is impossible, what avenues are left to Melior? Can she allow the tournament to take place, yet evade its inevitable consequence - marriage to the victor? Her sister, maliciously aggravating her distress, thinks not:

6770      Li vostre vos donront mari.  
             Il choisiront, vos amerois;  
             A lor chois vos amors donrois.  
             Cil doit choisir ki doit amer:  
 6774      Issi deüst li plains aler;  
             Hors de cest plait vos estes mise...

Urraque, with sisterly candour, then goes on to tell Melior that this situation is entirely her own fault, for she could have forgiven Partonopeus and obtained her vassals' consent to her marrying him, instead of hard-heartedly banishing her lover after their quarrel (6776-8). This unhelpful remark, however, should not be taken at face value, for it springs from Urraque's determination to make Melior repent for what Urraque considers her unfair treatment of Partonopeus. Rather, we may say that Melior's situation is not of her own devising, but is indeed that of the passage quoted above: in the personal matter of choosing a husband, whom she will be expected to love (36), she has in fact neither choice nor initiative. Her vassals will inevitably choose her husband for her, and she will have to marry the man of their choice. There is nothing she can do but allow matters to take

---

(36) It is worth noting that here again we find an example of the assumption that love and marriage go together. Urraque does not speak of Melior marrying a man she cannot love, but of her being expected to love her husband, whoever he is, as we see in lines 6771-2, quoted above.

their course, and sit by while her husband is selected for her (7099-7102, quoted on p. 446). She cannot refuse to marry the chosen man, unless she is prepared to take her refusal to the limit of preferring death or civil war to marriage. Short of these extremes, she might as well take Urrique's advice and accept her vassals' choice of husband with good grace:

6780	Prenez celui en vostre foi Tot sens rancune bonement Ki vaintra le tornolement. Cil fait le miech ke faire puet
6784	Ke fait de gre ke faire duet.

Thus, at the start of the tournament, Melior's plight is a grave one. She will be expected to marry the victor, and cannot know yet who that victor will be, nor, apart from his fighting skill, what qualities he will have. The only certain thing she knows about her future husband is that he cannot be Partonopeus, but Partonopeus is the one man she wants to marry. There is no constitutional way in which she can thwart her vassals' will, for it is her duty as empress to take a husband. Moreover, the vassals have force on their side. The only way in which Melior can evade a hateful marriage is by taking her own life - and this she is resolved to do. Even though she believes that Partonopeus is lost forever, it does not occur to her to make the best of her fate, as Urrique suggests, and try to find happiness with another husband; she will accept no husband but the man she has loved and lost.

During the first part of the 'tournament, Melior's attitude to the various combatants is one of indifference, since she does not care who wins:

8121 C'est Melior ki ne dist mot;  
 Rien ne li pleist de quant qu'el ot,  
 N'el tornoi nule rien ne voit  
 Dont ele cuit que proz li soit,  
 8125 Quar el n'i set pas son ami.

However, once she knows that one of the participants is in fact Partonopeus himself, Melior becomes intensely concerned that he should win, and her dread lest one of his rivals may be chosen becomes all the greater. Partonopeus' principal rival is the sultan of Persia, and the contest ends in a draw between the two. The majority of the judges, however, favour the sultan, and the author gives us an intriguing glimpse of the intimidation and bribery used to influence the judges' supposedly unbiased decision:

10071 Que por crieme, que por amor,  
 Atendent molt li jugeor  
 - Et li alquant por grant loier -  
 Al soldan del tot avancier. (37).

---

(37) I have re-punctuated this passage to make the sense clearer. Atendre here seems to have the meaning of entendre (see FL I, p.630, line 9). Two mss. in fact read entendre: "the judges intend to put the sultan forward..."

It seems, therefore, as though Melior may be forced by a corrupt judgment to marry her unwelcome suitor, the sultan (38).

Fortunately, Melior has by this stage abandoned her earlier passivity; like the other heroines we have looked at, she now seeks a way out of such a fate. Once again, the way chosen is a devious one; Melior does not openly declare her preference for Partonopeus, nor seek to impose her choice on her vassals by a frank confrontation. Instead, she pretends to prefer the sultan, and suggests that the two finalists should be judged on a different criterion from that of valour: their physical beauty, in which quality, she says, the sultan is bound to excel.

Melior's ruse of course ensures that Partonopeus is acclaimed the outright winner (10463-74), and that she successfully evades

---

(38) The choice of a Muslim as Partonopeus' chief rival indicates a certain degree of religious tolerance on the part of the author of this work. The sultan has, of course, promised to become a Christian if he is chosen to marry Melior, and the author apparently finds it plausible that six of the seven judges should prefer a converted pagan as their future emperor. Indeed, the marriage thus appears to be a notable triumph for Christianity, which will result in a mass conversion (10089-94). Only Ernol raises the possibility that a conversion made for such motives is not likely to be a lasting one (10263-82), or shows any mistrust of the sultan. In all other respects, the sultan is treated exactly on a par with the Christian participants in the tournament, and is indeed judged to excel all of them except Partonopeus in prowess and valour as a knight.



her unwelcome suitors (39). She also evades a conflict of wills with her vassals, since it is they who proclaim Partonopeus the winner; instead of antagonising them, she gracefully submits to their wishes (10475-10502). That Melior should instinctively turn in this way to trickery, and should seek to avoid an open conflict if possible, is yet another indication of the power her vassals exert. Championed by them, the sultan is indeed a grave threat to Melior's happiness, for she has little hope of overruling her vassals' choice. Her only way out of an unwelcome marriage, as we have noted, would be to kill herself.

Melior, then, is totally loyal to Partonopeus, and rejects all other suitors. The author of Partonopeus, unlike Chrétien, Beaumanoir and the authors of Eneas and Amadas, feels the need to make his heroine's intransigence the occasion for an admiring comment on women in general :

10109	A Melior pert clerelement Que dames aiment loialment, Qui ne daigne changier s'amor Por chevalier de tel valor,
10913	De tel belté, de tel richece, De tel fait et de tel noblece Cum est li bons soldans de Perse, Ains li est de fin cuer perverse.

---

(39) In the Arsenal ms., Melior's triumph is dimmed because the adaptor who produced this version, probably unhappy with the indecisive end of the tournament, follows the beauty contest with a final duel between Partonopeus and the sultan, in which the hero's prowess is at last vindicated and Melior becomes his prize (Gildea ed., Appendix I, lines 533-988).

Presumably intended as a counter-argument to anti-feminist assertions of female infidelity, this passage is an explicit statement of the feature to which we have already drawn attention: a suitor's intrinsic merits carry very little weight with a heroine who loves another man. The sultan is here presented as a highly desirable suitor, handsome, brave, rich and noble; but Melior has given her heart to Partonopeus, and is blind to the sultan's merits.

One heroine who does not remain intransigently faithful to her first love is La Fièvre, in Hue de Rotelande's Ipomedon. Like Partonopeus, this romance was probably written in the last quarter of the twelfth century (40). Both romances use the device of a tournament staged to choose a husband for the heroine, and the situation of La Fièvre is at one stage quite similar to Melior's. La Fièvre's vassals want her to marry for the sake of the realm; she loves Ipomedon and is resolved to marry him, but

---

(40) A. J. Holden dates Ipomedon "peu de temps après 1180" in his recent edition of the text (Paris, 1979), p.11. The date of Partonopeus is not discussed by J. Gildea in his edition of that work (2 vols, Villanova Pa., 1967-8), nor by L. P. Smith in his dissertation on the romance published as Vol.II, Part 2 of Gildea's edition. Recognising that his scheme "omits much that is traditionally included in a critical edition" (ed.cit., vol.II 2, p.iv), Gildea refers the reader to A. Fourrier's Le Courant Réaliste (Paris 1960), where "many of the elements that are lacking are accounted for". Fourrier dates Partonopeus "vers 1182-5", and certainly before 1188, date of Aymon de Varennes' Florimont, which he believes was much influenced by Partonopeus (op.cit., p.384 and note 142; p.449 and note 15; pp.450-9, passim). He also considers that Partonopeus influenced Ipomedon (op.cit., pp.447-8). Holden, however, believes, rightly in my view, that "Un lien de parenté unissant ces deux romans plus ou moins contemporains ne manque pas de vraisemblance, mais on ne saurait en préciser la direction." (ed. cit., p.50).

fears her haughtiness may have driven him from her forever. The tournament, however, is suggested by La Fièvre herself, and not by her barons, and fulfils something of the same purpose in her schemes as the beauty contest does in Melior's : it is a way of evading the barons' demands without openly defying them, and may also give Ipomedon the chance of winning her hand:

2497      Kar se mis amis est en vie  
             Jo ne quit pas ke il le lest mie  
             K'il ne venge, se Deu me salt,  
             Si il nule ren as armes valt.

Another difference between Ipomedon and Partonopeus is that La Fièvre is not altogether certain that Ipomedon will make a perfect husband for her. She sets great store by prowess in arms, and has indeed taken a vow to marry none but the best knight in the world (lines 119-132) (41). Ipomedon, however, has shown no sign of valour, and as far as she knows, he is "cuars" (521). This uncertainty leads her to adopt a curious attitude during the tournament itself, for she is torn between her love for Ipomedon and her love of prowess in a knight. As a result, she comes very

---

(41) The tournament is thus introduced more naturally into Ipomedon than into Partonopeus, where it is simply a convenient way of bringing about the dénouement and adding to the ration of fighting and suspense. La Fièvre's interest in prowess, on the other hand, provides a plausible reason for using a tournament as a way of choosing a husband for her, and the same motive is also used to bring about the lovers' separation, which in Partonopeus has no natural connexion with the other main theme, the tournament. These differences might suggest that, if one of the two works did indeed copy the other, the plagiarist was the author of Partonopeus.

near to welcoming as a husband a man other than the one she really loves, and thus represents a type of woman whom we have not so far encountered in this chapter: one who is prepared to assess different suitors on their merits, instead of adhering blindly to the one whom she first loved.

On the first day of the tournament, La Fièvre sees a strange knight in white armour performing great feats, and is very much drawn to him:

3865      La Fièvre estut aukes pensive  
             Et a sun quer tence e estrive,  
             Saveir mun se el deit sun ami  
             Lesser pur cestui k'el veit ci;  
 3869      En eïnes est se el deit cestui  
             Amer e ublier celui;  
             Ne fust la fine leauté,  
             Cestui eüst mut tost amé.

At the end of the day's fighting, she learns that the white knight is Ipomedon, but the next day he has disappeared. Yet, even though La Fièvre now knows that her lover is indeed valiant, she begins to pay attention to a heroic knight in scarlet:

4796      E dit en sun quer ke a bon dreit  
             Deit cest chevaler vermeil prendre  
             S'el n'ose sun ami attendre;  
             Ne fust sa trop grant leauté  
 4800      El l'eüst ja mut tost amé.

The red knight, of course, turns out to be Ipomedon again; but on the third day he is apparently defeated by a knight in black armour.

Although this newcomer has not only apparently ruined the chances of the man she hoped to marry, but also sent her a most arrogant message (5771-88), La Fièvre is so impressed by his prowess that:

6159      En sun quer mut se cumforta  
              E mut suvent se purpensa,  
              Se ele ad sun dreit ami perdu  
              Del neir vassal ferat sun dru.

La Fièvre's fickleness, which is provoked by her intense admiration for prowess in arms, shows us that not all heroines are determined to resist being married to any man but the one they love. In La Fièvre, we have an example of the very trait which the author of Partonopeus found so commendably absent in Melior: she is not only ready to accept as a husband a man other than her dreit ami, but also, finding him superior to her first love, to give her heart to the newcomer. Far from being de fin cuer perverse, La Fièvre has only a limited stock of fine leauté, and it is not enough to protect Ipomedon's interests against a man who appears to be more preux than he.

La Fièvre, however, is far from being a typical romance heroine. She is the protagonist of a work which, as A. J. Holden has shown, is in many ways a parody of the Arthurian romance of the period and of courtly conventions (42). In particular, Hue de Rotelande used his work to satirize women: "L'anti-féminisme de Hue est toujours

---

(42) Ipomedon, ed.cit., pp.44-57.

présent, tantôt à l'état sous-jacent, tantôt éclatant en propos désabusés qui dépassent en aigreur tout ce qu'on trouve habituellement dans les romans qui se donnent pour courtois." (ed. cit., p.55). La Fièvre's fickleness is dictated by this anti-feminist bias, and the fact that Hue's anti-feminism is exceptional in a courtly romance also explains why we have not found this trait in any of the other heroines we have considered (43).

In other respects, however, La Fièvre is not unlike other heroines who are under pressure to marry against their will. As in other cases, we find that the pressure is so strong that she can evade it only by trickery. Her chief stratagem is simply to play for time; as does Blonde, she asks for a delay, but in her case the extra twenty days are simply to give her time to think of some other ploy (1841-85). She then procrastinates further, firstly by an appeal to her overlord (1925 ff) (44), then by

---

(43) The only other heroine I have found who considers marrying a man other than the one she loves is Lidoine, in Meraugis de Portlesgues. Her case, however, is rather different, for she offers her hand to Gorvain, Meraugis' friend, only in order to escape the far more unwelcome prospect of marrying the son of Belchis li Lois (3902-35). Moreover, she has lost all hope of Meraugis, since she has seen him fall apparently dead; and her appeal to Gorvain does not contain any suggestion that she loves him, and does not result from fickleness, but from desperation.

(44) The feudal situation envisaged here is interesting, since it seems that La Fièvre's overlord has the right to sanction her choice of husband, but not to enforce marriage on her. La Fièvre calls in her overlord, who is also her uncle and thus, it would seem, the head of her lineage, on the grounds that she ought not to take a husband without his approval. The pressure to marry, however, comes from her vassals, not from her lord. This contrasts with the picture of the overlord's powers given in the section on Vis in Part II above (pp.89-92), which is derived from historical and canonical sources.

pretending to hesitate between three suitors (2421-34), and finally by suggesting the tournament, which is to take place in four months' time (2485-2572).

Like the fathers of Ydoine and the rest, and Melior's vassals, the men who control La Fièvre's marriage treat her consent as being of little importance. There is, indeed, a lively debate between the Calabrian barons, La Fièvre, and her overlord, which turns precisely on the issue of whether her wishes should be considered. One of the barons, Drias, champions La Fièvre; having objected to one candidate on the grounds that he is a homosexual, and will never make a woman happy, he suggests that La Fièvre herself might possibly have views on her marriage which would be worth hearing:

2383      Savez vus, reis, ke vus facez?  
             A lui meisme en cunsellez,  
             Ele est mut vecïee e sage  
             Et reset plus de sun curage,  
 2387      E meulz set u sis quers se trait;  
             Tuz jurz ala issi e vaît  
             Ke femme plus sun quer crera  
             Ke mul autre, u amer vodra.

That so self-evident a point should need to be stated in such detail is, surely, an indication of the novelty, to the kind of feudal baron depicted here, of the idea of obtaining the woman's views in such a case. Drias, moreover, is opposed by another baron, Amfion, who furiously asserts that La Fièvre's pretension to choose for herself the best knight in the world is folie, and that Drias has seriously harmed the interests of all La Fièvre's

vassals by supporting her in her attempt to choose her own husband. The argument is settled by La Fièvre's uncle, who calls Drias' suggestion curteis (2404) and then refers, like Melior, to the importance of such a choice in view of the indissolubility of marriage :

2405 De femme prendre e espuser  
N'est mie a billette juer,  
Ne valt plus le repentir ren,  
La u s'est pris se tenge ben. (45)

He then goes on to apportion the degree of choice allowed to La Fièvre and to her vassals :

2409 Il deit par vus estre esgardé  
E aukes a sa volenté,  
E se el dit ben, nus le feruns,  
E se nun, de tut le leiruns.

La Fièvre's uncle and overlord, then, asserts that she should be consulted, and that her choice should be adopted if it appears a good one ("if she speaks well"). However, if her opinion is judged to be not worth following, they will ignore it.

The irony of the situation is that Drias has only raised the question of La Fièvre's choice in the first place out of pure self-interest, and not out of any concern for the legal principle

---

(45) One notes that, even here, the question is envisaged from the man's point of view and not from the woman's. Ms. B, however, the only other ms. to give the complete text, reads "La u seit prise, la tinge ben" for line 2408: "where she is married, there let her stay". In this reading, the feminine ending of the past participle shifts the perspective from the man to the woman.



of consent. He is enjoying the wars which La Fièvre's husbandless state has generated, and seeks to prevent her being married in order to perpetuate a pleasurable, and no doubt profitable, state of strife. It seems very likely that, had his personal interests lain in the other direction, as do Amfion's, he would have denied La Fièvre's right to be consulted as energetically as he here defends it.

Having studied cases where a heroine is pressurized by her father or by her vassals to take a husband she does not love, let us finally look at an instance where force is used by the suitor himself, in the form of a military attack on the heroine's domains. Gautier d'Arras' Ganor, whose situation we shall examine, is in point of fact not besieged, as are the other heroines mentioned in note 3 to the present chapter, since her unwelcome suitor invades Italy but does not reach Rome itself; the use of armed might by the unwelcome suitor is, however, a common point in all these cases.

Suitors who thus resort to force are almost universally presented as unsympathetic, not to say evil, characters. There is no question here of the suitor being, like Turmus, the count of Nevers or even the sultan of Persia, a man who would be an acceptable husband were it not for the heroine's love for another. Ganor's suitor, the emperor of Constantinople, has already tried to take Rome by force during her father's lifetime, and is known to have caused the death of a previous wife by his ill-treatment

(4495-7) (46). He is thus a man whose suit could hardly be welcome to Ganor, even if she had not already given her heart to Ille. Similarly, Alimodès, who besieges l'Orgueilleuse d'Amor, and Leonin, who besieges La Fièvre, are thoroughly unpleasant; both are pagans, and Leonin is proud, cruel and extraordinarily ugly (Ipomedon 7676-7718), while Alimodès is a felon viellart (Blancandin 4826) (47).

It is not surprising, then, that Ganor's resistance of her unwelcome suitor is both energetic and resolute, even though she knows Ille is happily married to Galeron. Unfortunately, some of her own vassals do not support her stand, and indeed try to persuade her to marry the emperor in order to end the war (48).

(46) All references to Ille et Galeron in this chapter are taken from the SATF edition, except where indicated. The previous wife referred to here was Ganor's cousin, so that the marriage would be dirimated by the impediment of affinity. Surprisingly, Ganor does not elaborate on this, although it would seem to be an excellent reason for her to refuse the emperor. Since it is unlikely that Gautier was ignorant of the existence of this impediment, it may well be that he considered it an unsafe argument for Ganor to use, in view of the ease with which dispensations from it were granted.

(47) In Meraugis, it is the father of the unwelcome suitor who is ugly and unpleasant (3760 ff), and it is he who tries to use force to bring about the marriage. Lidoine, who has not seen the son she is expected to marry, hates him on the evidence of his father's looks and character (3872-82).

(48) The motif of the vassals' disaffection recurs in several other stories of besieged ladies: Fenise's men, for instance, are bought off by the treacherous Nogant (Durmart 10651-68), and Galiene's vassals refuse to defend her against her enemy (Fergus p.120 lines 11-15 and p.144 lines 2-16).

Ganor, therefore, has to face pressure not only from her unwelcome suitor, but also from her own vassals, so that her situation is doubly difficult. Her vassals, like those of Melior and la Fièvre, urge her to marry for the sake of her domains; her people are being killed and maimed by the invader, and she could put a stop to the slaughter by agreeing to become his wife. Yet, as she points out, the means taken by the Greek emperor to press his suit are proof in themselves that such a marriage would hardly be in the public interest, let alone attractive to her personally :

5288      Segnor, loés le vos en foi, (the SATF ed. prints "loés")  
             Por ce qu'il les ocit por moi,  
             Et por la moie druerie?  
             Ci a bele cevalerie  
 5292      Por apaier cuer de pucele  
             Et d'une haute damoisele!  
             Doi ge dont soie devenir  
             Qui se painne de moi honir? (49)

Her vassals, then, have not even the excuse of the common weal for their attempt to force Ganor into the arms of her unwelcome suitor. They are, indeed, actively treacherous, in a way that goes far beyond the self-interest shown by La Fièvre's barons or the venality of the judges at Melior's tournament. The possibility

---

(49) The last two lines of the speech of Ganor's, lines 5305-6 of the Wollaton Hall ms. (not quoted here) are printed by Cowper as part of the vassals' reply. These lines ("Comment? volés me vos destruire/Por .I. tel home con il est?") continue the thought of the immediately preceding line, in which Ganor declares she would rather die than marry the emperor. Cowper's punctuation was no doubt influenced by the reading of the Paris ms., in which these two lines (6206-7) are apparently spoken by the vassals, who ask "Nos volés vos destruire?"

for such treachery arises from the fact that the unwelcome suitor is an enemy with an invading army, for this creates a situation in which a betrayal of Ganor's matrimonial interests is also a betrayal of the head of the state, and hence of the empire itself. Ten of Ganor's highest men have been given rich bribes by the invader to collaborate with him in his conquest of her domain, and to hand her over to him if she returns from her search for Ille before the conquest is complete (5258-76). This they proceed to do, kidnapping their liege lady in order to take her treacherously to the Greek emperor's camp. Thus the wickedness of the invading suitor appears to be infectious, and affects even those who should oppose it. Gautier comments with feeling on the diabolical nature of such treachery (5402-5413). Of more interest to us, however, is his comment on the specifically matrimonial aspect of the vassals' plot :

5340	Grans peccíés est, si con moi samble De metre feme et ome ensamble Des que on set qu'il s'entreheent, Grant peciét font, qui a ço beent.
5344	Tels ne het point al commencer Qui puis ne fine de tencier Et het sa feme mortelment Et ele lui tot ensement,
5348	Ne pais ne bien n'ont puis entr'aus.

These remarks show an admirable realism and common sense. They also indicate, however, that the doctrine that "Consensus facit muptias" was either unknown to Gautier, or seemed to him of little account. He does not oppose forced marriages on the grounds that

lack of consent must make them null, but on practical and, in a sense, humanitarian grounds : such marriages are hardly likely to be happy ones.

Faced with physical force, both from the invading suitor and from the vassals who abduct her, Ganor has not even the resource of trickery which is open to those heroines who face only moral pressure from their father or vassals. In her helplessness and despair, she turns to that solution which those other heroines had seen only as their last resort : suicide. As the traitors carry her off to her enemy's camp, she

5489       Ja s'ocessist en icele eure  
              Se ele eüst sosiel de qoi.

This desperation underlines the chief difference between the heroines whose unwelcome suitor makes war on her and whose suitor is imposed by peaceful means. A heroine has no defence against brute force, and such force is the prerogative of men. That feminine guile, which is commented on with mingled wonder and disapproval by the authors of such works as Amadas, Partonopeus or Ipomedon, is of no avail against open aggression. Heroines who are the object of such attacks are helpless victims, dependent on their barons to fight for them and, ultimately, on the hero to rescue them. Thus the predicament of the besieged heroine provides a telling illustration of the defencelessness of the feme desconselliee, the woman left without male protection and advice, in feudal society. In such conditions, it is scarcely

surprising that women resorted to trickery, and that such trickery came to be seen as a peculiarly feminine attribute.

What may seem rather more surprising than the heroine's recourse to guile is her recourse to suicide. The taking of one's own life was condemned by the Church as an infringement of the commandment "thou shalt not kill", and also as the sin of despair, since the suicide shows no faith in God's mercy (50). Yet it is the means of escape envisaged by nearly all our heroines who have no other way of avoiding an unwelcome suitor. Very few of them look to the Christian solution of the convent as the answer to their dilemma. Galeron envisages becoming a nun if her brother does not allow her to marry Ille :

Sire Dix! qu'en dira li dus?  
S'il ne le veut, je n'en sai plus;  
Mais tot le secle guerpilai,  
Et por amor Diu m'en irai  
En l'abëie de nounains.

(Foerster ed., lines 1403-7.  
Passage omitted from ms.W)

However, we should note that here Galeron is not faced by the prospect of an unwanted suitor, but rather by the possibility of

---

(50) The grounds for the canonical condemnation of suicide are given in the Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique, vol.7, col.1113. See also M. -N. Lefay-Toury, La Tentation du Suicide dans le Roman Français au XIIIe siècle (Paris 1979), pp.2-3, for St Augustine's energetic condemnation of suicide. Lefay-Toury notes that the characters who succeed in killing themselves in romances of this period are in fact normally pagans, not Christians (p. 12), and that the temptation of suicide is often the sign of a passionate, emotional nature (pp.124-7). The bodies of suicides, which were refused burial in consecrated ground, were often buried at cross-roads. Lines 1909-10 of Bérout's Tristan (ed. Ewert, Oxford 1939), refer to this custom: "A la Croiz Røge, au chemin fors, / la on enfuet sovent les cors". The practice of cross-road burial of suicides is not noted by Ewert (ed. cit., vol. II, (Oxford 1970), p.183) nor by Reid (The "Tristran" of Bérout: A Textual Commentary (Oxford 1972), p.71), although it supports Frappier's interpretation of fors here as "fourchu", the interpretation favoured by Ewert and accepted by Reid.

being unable to marry the man she does want. Later, when her brother announces that he would like her to take a husband, she declares that death would be preferable to an unwanted marriage:

Car je vauroie mie estre arse  
Et fust a vant la pourre esparse,  
Que jel fëisse contre cuer.

(Foerster ed., lines 1447-9.  
Passage omitted from ms.W)

Evidently there is a fair degree of hyperbole in such a statement; but it is remarkable that even the pious Galeron, who does indeed end her days in a convent, should think of death rather than the cloister as the alternative to a loveless marriage. Lydaine, in Claris et Laris, also thinks of becoming a nun; and in her case, too, this is a reaction to the possibility that she may never be able to marry the man she loves, rather than to the threat of a loveless union (lines 13703-6). On the other hand, we have seen how Lavinia, Blonde, Ydoine, Melior and Ganor think of suicide as their escape from marriage to men they cannot love. Similarly, Galiene in Fergus is prepared to throw herself from the top of her tower rather than submit to the invading king (Fergus p.149 lines 8-28 and p.155 line 22 - p.156 line 19).

Abandoned heroines, too, turn to suicide rather than to the cloister. Thus Guenloie tries to kill herself when she believes Yder is lost (Yder 2554-2658); Aelis, abandoned by Guillaume,

thinks of drowning herself (L'Escoufle 4736 ff.); Lidoine, too, tries to drown herself on seeing Meraugis apparently fall dead (Meraugis 3276-81); and Enide, believing Erec dead, is prepared to take her own life (Erec 4617-35) (51). Why suicide should thus be preferred to the convent by heroines who have lost all hope of worldly happiness I am not able to say, though the answer may possibly lie in the fact that suicide, as the supreme gesture of despair, seemed to authors the most appropriate expression of a heroine's emotions in such crises.

The recourse to suicide is also, as we have said, like the recourse to trickery, an indication of the amount of pressure imposed on heroines who seek to evade a loveless marriage. It would seem that the use of such coercion must mean that any marriage so contracted would be nullified by the impediment of vis et metus; yet, strangely, the only author to refer explicitly to this impediment is the author of Amadas. Implicitly, the impediment may form part of the "parallel reading" which is suggested for Cligès, and it also underpins Blonde's idea of refusing her husband in the wedding ceremony. Otherwise, authors show little or no awareness of the nullity of such marriages. Nor do they depict the men who arrange them as being evil, or cruel, or as acting against God's law. Indeed, the fathers and vassals concerned are generally acting in good faith, with the reasonable

---

(51) Enide's attempted suicide is commented on, and compared with other attempted suicides in Chrétien, by M. -N. Lefay-Toury, op.cit., pp.92-135.



and indeed laudable aims of ensuring the legal succession of the domain and of providing husbands and protectors for the women in their charge. Only when force is used by the suitor himself, in the form of an armed invasion, is it condemned; such suitors, as we have remarked, are almost always presented as evil men, as felons (52). It appears, then, that these romances provide an effective illustration of the shortcomings of vis et metus, particularly as it applied to women. As we pointed out in Part II above, pp.85-93, the degree of coercion which gave rise to the impediment was defined as that which might influence a steadfast man (constans vir), rather than a member of the weaker sex. Moreover, the Church was very slow to admit that moral pressure might also constitute vis. Indeed, the Popes themselves used the moral weapon of excommunication to force their female vassals into suitable marriages (see above, pp.91-2). Hence it is scarcely surprising that, in texts written for a lay audience, there should be so little recognition that the consent which makes a marriage must be a free consent, and that such freedom is not necessarily present when a woman marries a man chosen for her by her male guardians.

---

(52) It is possible that this markedly unsympathetic presentation of suitors who try to win brides by armed force is a reflection of the abhorrence for the abduction of women (raptus) in medieval society. G. Duby remarks in Le Chevalier, La Femme et Le Prêtre (Paris 1981), p.43, that : "Il incombait au roi de poursuivre les ravisseurs comme il poursuivait les incendiaires, les meurtriers et les larrons : le rapt est, à l'époque féodale, l'un des quatre cas de la justice de sang".

#### Chapter 4. Attitudes of Heroines to a Husband of Higher Rank.

---

Although the number of heroines who make rich marriages is comparatively small (1), so that generalisations about them are difficult, one can fairly say that the creators of these heroines faced the same basic difficulty as did the authors of the romances in which it is the hero who marries well : namely, the problem of establishing that the protagonist is not motivated by greed. However, this problem does not seem to be so acute in the case of the heroine. Only rarely is the difficulty solved by giving the heroine no apparent interest in marriage at all; as a rule, heroines who marry above their station make no secret of their desire for marriage. Moreover, the impoverished heroine is more likely than the similarly-placed hero to show that she is aware of the material and social gains to be made from a rich marriage; there is less tendency, in her case, to concentrate attention on love alone. Indeed, there are heroines who make rich marriages without any suggestion that they are in love with the man concerned; the most striking example, of course, is Liénor in Jean Renart's Roman de la Rose. Nevertheless, in spite of this greater readiness to deal openly with the material gains of marrying above one's

---

(1) I have found eight heroines who come into this category. They will be discussed in the following order: Blanche-flor (Floire et Blanche-flor); Fresne (Galeran de Bretagne), Fresne (Marie de France, Le Fresne), Joie (La Manekine), Liénor (Guillaume de Dole), Athanaïs (Eracle), Gratiene (Guillaume d'Angleterre), Enide (Erec et Enide). On the other hand, heroines who are equal or superior in rank to the men they marry number at least thirty.

station in cases where the heroine, not the hero, is the beneficiary, authors are still concerned to show that their protagonist is not acting from mercenary motives. As is the case with many heroes, these heroines will think of their rich marriages in terms of honour and prestige rather than as the key to lands and wealth, and, where appropriate, the author will be careful to show that love is by far the most important consideration.

Since the question of whether or not the heroine is in love is clearly of major significance, we shall deal separately with those heroines who are not in love with the rich men they marry. First, however, let us look at those heroines who do indeed fall in love with young men richer and nobler than themselves.

One of the earliest works to present a heroine of inferior status to the hero is the "version aristocratique" of Floire et Blancheflor. In this roman idyllique, neither hero nor heroine is much concerned with such adult problems as difference in rank or the transfer of wealth through marriage (2). Indeed, neither of them shows much interest in marriage itself. We have already noted this childish indifference to the problems created by their love in discussing Floire; in the case of Blancheflor, we find the same inability to look beyond the joy or grief of the moment.

---

(2) Cp. M. Lot-Borodine, Le Roman Idyllique au Moyen Age (Paris 1913), pp. 68-70, where the "ignorance absolue de la vie réelle" of Floire and Blancheflor is sensitively analysed.

The picture of Blanchefflor, however, is less detailed than that of Floire, and we are told far less about her reactions to her situation, especially in the earlier sections of the romance. Indeed, from the opening of the romance until the reunion of the lovers in the emir's tower, we learn nothing of Blanchefflor's feelings except that she reciprocates Floire's love (213-262) and that she appeared very sad after being sold to the merchants (1349-54). We are given no idea whether she expects to marry Floire, nor what her attitude might be to the riches and status of such a marriage.

When we do learn of Blanchefflor's feelings, we discover that love is her unique preoccupation. Deprived of love, such pleasures as the gift of a rare flower are meaningless to her (2176-81). She sees the prospect of being forced to marry the emir entirely in terms of love:

2183	Ne durra més gaires ma vie; Li amiranz me doit avoir Si con l'en dit et je espoir, Més se Dieus plest, ja ne m'avra
2187	Ne reprouchié ne me sera Que par destroit d'autrui amour Lest le biau Floire Blanchefflor. Pour seue amor engin querré
2191	Que a par main je m'ocirré.

Thus Blanchefflor's preoccupation with love is so strong that she even refers to marriage with the emir — hardly a love-match — as autrui amour (3).

---

(3) Curiously, Blanchefflor's objection to the emir does not seem to be concerned in any way with his habit of putting his brides to death; she does not once refer to this unwelcome consequence of marrying the emir, but objects to the marriage solely as a betrayal of her love for Floire.

Neither does the rest of the romance show Blanche flor with any thought but that of love. On seeing Floire again, she is surprised and overjoyed at this reunion with her sweetheart, but does not appear to give any thought to the chances of marrying him (2260-73). Indeed, she is perfectly happy to live with him forever as clandestine lovers in the emir's tower :

2288        Se cele vie lor durast,  
             Nus d'euls changier ne la rouvast.

When they are discovered, her one idea is to take the blame and protect her sweetheart (2589-99, 2718-29). Finally, she is married to Floire without our having any explicit information about her attitude to him as a husband, or to the rank and riches she will gain by marrying him (2892-4). It is left to Blanche flor's mother to express satisfaction at her daughter's -- and her own -- change of fortune through marriage :

3034        Quant sa fille voit coronnee  
             Et ele est duchesse clamee,  
             A Damedieu graces en rent  
             Et sel mercie durement.

Nevertheless, we do have one indication that Blanche flor is not totally ignorant of the benefits of making a rich marriage. Having herself married for love, Blanche flor immediately arranges that her friend Claris shall marry for money and status :

2896        Par le conseil de Blanche flor  
             La prent l'amiral a oisor.

Thus, although Blanchefflor thinks only of love and not of fortune in her own case, in the case of Claris she does the exact opposite. Clearly, the author does not mean us to take this for cynicism on Blanchefflor's part. His heroine is arranging a happy ending for Claris as well as for herself; she will see that Claris, who is not in love, is assured of happiness through rank and wealth. The author is not conscious of any inconsistency in his heroine's conduct, since there is, fundamentally, no inconsistency in his presentation of marriage from her point of view. In making Floire a rich prince, and in letting it be clearly understood that the couple's love would lead to marriage (4), the author shows us that he is perfectly aware of the material benefits of Blanchefflor's making such a good match. He simply chooses, in depicting his heroine's feelings, to ignore this obvious fact and to concentrate on her love — for love is what the story is all about, as he tells his audience in lines 1-6 of the romance.

Blanchefflor, then, seems to fit neatly into the pattern we have already described in the case of heroes who marry above their station. She thinks and speaks as though the idea of marriage, with its dazzling social and material prospects, had never entered her head, and we can see that this behaviour may well result from the author's desire to present her as an idealised lover, adoring Floire for himself alone and not for his fortune. When narrating

---

(4) The eventual marriage of Floire to Blanchefflor is already suggested by the prologue to the romance (lines 7-24), where the couple are described as the parents of Berthe aux Grands Pieds.

Clariss' marriage, the author is no longer concerned to show Blanchefflor as an admirable lover, but rather as an admirable friend, rewarding those who have befriended her (5). At this point, the idea of making one's fortune through marriage, which has been pushed into the background by the need to concentrate on disinterested love, comes naturally to the fore.

In the "version chevaleresque" of Floire, we find a very similar pattern. Although the author of this version pays more attention to the heroine's feelings and reactions than does the author of the first version, we learn no more about her attitude to marriage. Like the Blanchefflor of the roman idyllique, the Blanchefflor of the roman chevaleresque thinks of love, and not of marriage, in her relationship with Floire. Thus we are given her farewell to her lover when he is sent away to study (279-304) and her lament on being sold to the merchants (1374-93), as well as her reaction to the king's condemnation (525-38) and her prière du plus grand péril before going to the stake (751-826), without a single reference on her part to her chances of marrying Floire. The author dramatises the pathos of her situation, but clearly had no interest in marriage.

---

(5) We have seen (above, Part III, Chapter 4), that many heroes, including Floire himself, also use materialistic rather than romantic criteria for rewarding their friends and followers through marriage.

Turning to Galeran de Bretagne, we find that the figure of Fresne is far more fully treated than that of Blancheflor. There is the same tendency to concentrate on love as the heroine's most important motive, but the issues of marriage, and of the wealth and status it will confer, are not neglected.

One striking difference between Fresne and Blancheflor is the former's tendency to associate the idea of love explicitly with that of marriage. We have already drawn attention in Part IV, Chapter 2, to the passage where, on first telling Lohier of her love, she assures him that she expects to marry Galeran, and that the young man's love for her is a certain guarantee of his intentions :

1590 Dame seray de sa maison,  
 Sa femme et sa loyal espouse.  
 Je n'en suis mie trop jalouse,  
 Car de lui suis seüre et fie :  
 1594 Amours bonnement m'en affie.

Later, when challenged by the abbess, Fresne again speaks openly of marriage as the outcome of her love for Galeran :

3890 S'or peüst estre que j'amasse  
 Un conte dont je fusse amee,  
 Encore puisse je estre clamee  
 Contesse et dame de grant terre!

Again, when telling her story to Rose (6550-3) and to Gente (7214-29), Fresne emphasises that her love for Galeran led to a betrothal between them, and that she fully expected him to marry her.



As we have remarked, such frank interest in marriage is more likely to be found in a heroine than in a hero, and is often noticeably absent in heroes who — like Fresne — marry above their station. Indeed, taking an open interest in marriage might, we saw, create an impression of cupidity unsuitable for the hero or heroine of a romance. Renaut (6), however, manages to avoid giving any impression that Fresne is a fortune-hunter, despite her explicit desire to marry Galeran. To this end, Renaut emphasises the strength of his heroine's love, and shows that this disinterested love is the main motive for her actions.

In balancing this stress on love against the stress which he also places on Fresne's interest in marriage, Renaut displays his skill at subtle characterisation. We have seen how Fresne on several occasions declares that she confidently expects to marry Galeran. It will be noticed that all these declarations occur when Fresne is defending or explaining her actions to other people. In private, and with Galeran, Fresne is far less confident about his intentions, and thinks and speaks far more about love than she does about marriage. In thus exploiting a very natural difference between Fresne's brave front for the outside world, and her inner feelings, Renaut is able both to create a realistic and moving

---

(6) As indicated above in Part IV, Chap.2, note 5, I fully accept that the "Renans" who is named as the author of Galeran in line 7798 of the only surviving ms. of that work is not the same man as Jean Renart. In order to distinguish clearly between the two, I have adopted the spelling "Renaut" for the author of Galeran, following the usage of, among others, O. Klapp in his Bibliographie der Französischen Literaturwissenschaft and F. Lyons in Les Eléments Descriptifs (Geneva 1965).

character, and to give due weight to Fresne's love as the source of her desire for marriage.

Fresne's private doubts are first revealed in a passage which explicitly contrasts with the assurance of her declaration to Lohier (lines 1590-4, quoted above). There, she had said that Love assured her of Galeran's good faith; now, we hear her ask him:

2187      Et comment me puet ferme faire  
              Amours qui m'est tout a contrere,  
              Qui me fait entendant la briche?

She fears that his high rank will inevitably lead to their separation; Galeran will leave Biausejour and, in spite of himself, will love someone else (2190-2207). She, on the other hand, will always love him (2210-15, 2226-32).

It is noticeable that, in this passage, Fresne makes no explicit mention of marriage. Her fear that Galeran will not marry her seems unimportant beside her fear that he will not always love her; she sees her predicament as that of the abandoned lover, not that of the jilted fiancée. It is Galeran who, in his reply, interprets her request for reassurance about his love as a plea for more certainty about their betrothal, and makes her a formal promise of marriage (2242-49). Thus Renaut uses his heroine's very natural sense of insecurity as an opportunity to emphasise the strength and constancy of her love, and to show that her interest in marriage is born of that love, and not of a desire for rank and wealth.

The same emphasis on love is seen in Fresne's later adventures. Galeran's departure from Biausejour is the occasion of a long reverie in which Fresne laments her lover's absence, (2583-2680), but makes only one veiled reference to marriage (7). When Galeran sends her a message reiterating his promise to marry her, Fresne's reply deliberately puts the emphasis on love. She will always love him, whether he keeps the promise made in his letter or not:

3172 Mais que qu'il face je seray  
 Siene, n'autruy estre ne vueil;  
 Que que j'aye trové u fueil,  
 Ne que qu'il face ne qu'il die,  
 3176 Entree sui en l'enresdie,  
 Siene mouray; ce est m'estuide.

Later, when she learns that Galeran has indeed failed to keep his promise, and is to marry someone else, it is the loss of his love that Fresne laments, not the loss of a rich marriage. She sees Galeran's disloyalty as a sign that he never really loved her (6484-93); she, for her part, will always love him, in spite of his lack of faith:

6474 Se Dieux a l'ame me consault,  
 Ja pour ce faillir ne li vueil,  
 Qui me vendroit de grant orgueil  
 Se pour ce en oubly le mettoie.

Such passages are clearly meant to show us that Fresne does not just love Galeran because he has promised to make her a countess. Her love transcends any base considerations of material and social

---

(7) Lines 2676-7: "A li me sache Amours et tire,/Qu'endeux nous joint et met ensemble" suggest that marriage is in Fresne's mind.

advantage; it is a pure, profound and disinterested sentiment, entirely worthy of the heroine of a romance.

Nevertheless, Renaut wanted to make it absolutely clear that his heroine did indeed expect to marry Galeran. As we noted in discussing heroines' attitudes to sexual relations outside marriage, this insistence probably arose from Renaut's wish to give his romance a high moral tone. Imbued with a strongly religious sense of morality, Renaut was determined to present his heroine as one who would never contemplate the life of concubinage so cheerfully accepted by her namesake in Marie's lai. However, by insisting so firmly on the fact that Fresne has her sights set on marriage, Renaut risked giving his audience the impression that his heroine was a fortune-hunter. In finding a way round the difficulty, Renaut hit on the skilful idea of making other characters the mouthpieces of Fresne's interest in marriage. In this way the fact that marriage is her goal is not lost on the reader, while the heroine herself appears to be mainly concerned with altruistic love.

We have already seen how Galeran himself fulfils this purpose of Renaut's, by replying to Fresne's doubts about his love with promises of marriage. On other occasions, too, Galeran reassures Fresne in the same way, making specific references to their marriage although she has not herself mentioned the subject (2848-76, 3137-40). Lohier and his sister, too, are used as

spokesmen for Fresne, and their concern for their god-daughter leads them to express doubts about Galeran's intentions which encourage the young man to make it clear that the goal of their love is marriage (1815-33, 2485-2518).

In order to preserve Fresne still more effectively from the taint of cupidity, Renaut has a third method. Like many other authors who dealt with this problem, he plays down the fact that her marriage will make the heroine's fortune, and instead lays particular stress on the resulting improvement in Fresne's social status. The difference between Fresne and Galeran is nearly always presented as a difference of rank, rather than one of fortune, and Fresne's aspirations towards such a noble union are seen as laudable signs of the innate nobility of her own nature and origins.

This is the interpretation placed on Fresne's sentiments from the moment she first reveals them to Lohier. She hotly denies his suggestion that the man she hopes to marry is a "sergens, varlez ou escuiers" (1575); her heart is not so lowly and base (villaine) that she would stoop to love such a person (1576-81). Instead, she boasts, she loves Galeran, and will be his wife (1582-91). Lohier recognises this as a sign of Fresne's own nobility of birth:

1606      La nature de son linaige,  
             Quel qu'il soit, cougnoist a ses diz,  
             Quant elle a villains contrediz  
             Les quelx elle ne veult amer.

In Fresne's stormy interview with the abbess, the emphasis is again placed on the difference in rank between her and Galeran, and it is again suggested that Fresne's attempt to "catch" a count is a sign of the nobility of her heart :

3874      Je ne suis mie de cuer basse,  
             Car basseté de petit cuer  
             Met souvent fame a petit fuer,  
             Et qui chace oisel oisel prent.

The implication is clearly that Fresne, in trying to catch bigger game than mere songbirds (8), displays the noble aspirations of a noble nature. In such passages, Renaut places Fresne's marriage firmly in the context of an improvement in her status, and puts a most honourable interpretation on his heroine's desire for an ennobling marriage.

Other passages, too, treat Fresne's marriage as one which will ennoble her, rather than one which will make her rich. Lohier's sister, using an argument with which we are already familiar,

---

(8) The expression "Qui chace oisel, oisel prent" (line 3877) has the air of a proverb, but is not attested in Morawski, Proverbes Français (CFMA, Paris 1925). This line is not commented on in the notes or glossary of Foulet's edition of Galeran, but it is clear from the context that the meaning is something like "If you hunt small game, small game is all you will catch". The interpretation of oisel here as "songbirds" or "small birds" accords with the instances of the use of oisel given by TL: in the general sense of "Vogel", the great majority of examples in fact refer to songbirds. The specialised sense of "Jagdvogel", on the other hand, seems to be ruled out as a possible meaning for oisel in line 3877 of Galeran; the birds in question are clearly prey which one might hunt with hawks, not hawks themselves. In connexion with the first two lines of the passage quoted here (lines 3874-5), it seems that we have here a reference to the concept of riche cuer, whose importance we have already noted in the case of heroes whose innate nobility makes them aspire to a noble marriage.

declares that Fresne's beauty and goodness make her the equal of the queen of France (1924-31), and also that Fresne's perfection is such that any husband would be ennobled by marrying her, rather than the contrary:

1909	Car li homs de riens ne s'amonte, Qui prent parage, avoir et honte;...
1913	Mais femme sage, c'est li voirs, Vault mieulx que parage n'avoirs; Moult fait proudom belle gaaigne Qui belle et sage a a compaigne...
1919	...quar se bonne apresure Ne sens de femme ne mesure Doit alever n'essaulcier homme, Donc seroit cil sire de Rome,
1923	S'il la vouloit a femme prendre.

Although Lohier's sister refers to avoir in the lines quoted (1910, 1914), it will be seen that the emphasis is all on rank rather than on riches. The stress on rank is seen again in the episode where the abbess contemptuously gives Fresne the cloth, pillow and cradle with which she was found as a baby. Fresne remarks on the richness of the cloth and pillow, but only as signs that her origins must have been noble, and that she is a worthy bride for Galeran :

3968	Par ce me puet cons ou roys prendre, Car j'en voy cy bon tesmoignage; Ce drap note moult hault linage, Qu'avoir me pourroit a moullier,
3972	Je sçay bien par cest oreillier, Vo niés Galeran de Bretagne.

Here again, we see Fresne's readiness to be quite open in claiming the right to marry Galeran; and once again the marriage is seen entirely in terms of the difference in rank between the two of them, with no mention of the even greater difference in wealth.

The same emphasis on status is seen again in a later passage, when Fresne learns of Galeran's apparent disloyalty, which she attributes entirely to the discrepancy in their social positions:

6478      Lasse! il scet bien que je n'estoie  
             Ne sa pareille, n'endroit luy,  
             Que je ne sçay nommer cely  
             Qui m'apartiengne, tant en voye.  
 6482      Par foy, ce l'a bien mis en voye  
             De moy laissier et autre prendre.

Only when pushed to the limit by the abbess does Fresne deal with the material gains of marrying Galeran, and even then she does so in a way which clears her of any charge of cupidity. Her words contain no suggestion that she wants riches for their own sake, nor that she wishes to marry Galeran in order to be rich. Instead, she treats wordly wealth as an unlooked-for blessing, a reward given by God to the virtuous:

3908      Tel ra povres au nestre esté  
             C'on voit puis mourir en richesse:  
             Hom qui ayme senz et proesse  
             Ne se devroit ja esmayer,  
 3912      Car Dieux le savra bien paier.

Renaut, then, like other authors whose protagonist makes a particularly good marriage, faces the problem of showing that it is love, and not greed, which motivates his personage. One of the solutions commonly adopted by those other authors is also used by Renaut : he plays down the fact that his heroine will be made rich by her marriage, and emphasises instead the noble rank which marriage will confer on her. He also uses another very



popular technique, that of laying particular stress on the strength and purity of the love felt by his protagonist. However, unlike either the author of Floire et Blancheflor or the authors of romances in which it is the hero who marries above his station, Renaut does not neglect marriage altogether. Indeed, he seeks to make it absolutely clear that marriage is his heroine's goal. We saw in an earlier chapter that this insistence on Fresne's desire for marriage is partly the result of Renaut's determination to endow his heroine with the moral purity he found lacking in his model, Marie's Fresne. If we turn now to examine Marie's lai, we shall see that its heroine indeed has, as far as we can judge, a somewhat different moral code from the heroine of Galeran de Bretagne.

As a commentator has pointed out, "nowhere is it clearer than in Le Fresne that Marie's conception of good or evil love does not depend ... on whether or not the relationship is carnal."(9). As a result, Marie's Le Fresne is in some ways the opposite of Renaut's Fresne. Where the latter confidently hopes for marriage, and abhors the very idea of sexual relations outside wedlock, Marie's heroine clearly has no expectation that she will marry the man she loves, and instead accepts a carnal relationship outside marriage as the only possible fulfilment of her love for a man of much higher rank than her own. Thus Le Fresne resembles Blancheflor more closely than she does Renaut's Fresne : she

---

(9) E.J.Michel, "A Reconsideration of the Lais of Marie de France", Speculum 46 (1971), p.49.

does not think of marriage, and her actions are motivated by love alone (Marie tells us that she goes to live with Gurun because she "durement l'amot", l.289). However, where Blanche-flor's apparent indifference to marriage can be seen as the carelessness of a child, Le Fresne's lack of matrimonial ambition is clearly the fruit of her mature acceptance of social realities. Knowing that any marriage between herself and Gurun is out of the question, she smilingly resigns herself to the rôle of concubine, and even prepares with generosity to make way for the socially acceptable bride who will supplant her. In this, too, she contrasts with Renaut's Fresne, who has neither her humility, nor her acceptance of the facts of social inequality.

Marie, then, seems to have found an excellent solution to the problem of showing that a heroine who makes a rich marriage is not motivated by greed. Like other authors, she emphasises that her protagonist is acting from unselfish love; but, unlike some of her fellow writers, she makes the consequent neglect of marriage a perfectly natural and integral feature of the heroine's character. In romances where the poor hero, in love with a rich heroine, suddenly reveals at the end that he has all along been hoping to marry her, we may feel a certain surprise at the way in which marriage has previously been neglected. In Le Fresne, on the other hand, the heroine has understandably neglected the idea of marriage, since she knew it was impossible, and this renunciation, far from being surprising, is a natural consequence of her innate goodness and humility. One wonders, however, whether the very

success of Marie's "solution" does not lie in the fact that she had a slightly different aim from that of most writers of courtly romances. Where the latter usually set out to depict the ennobling effects of fine amor, Marie in Le Fresne was trying rather to portray an example of self-abnegation, a fore-runner of Patient Griselda, whose unselfishness could fortuitously be seen to best advantage in a love-story (10).

The last of our heroines who love above their station is Joie in Beaumanoir's Manekine. Like the three we have already discussed, Joie's main interest is in love. However, unlike Blanche-flor and Marie's Fresne, she does not ignore the question of marriage. Instead, she makes it clear that marriage with the king of Scotland is her heart's desire. As we have come to expect, she sees this marriage as one which would confer great honour on her, rather than as a union which would make her rich. This is, perhaps, slightly surprising in her case, since Joie knows that she is equal in birth to the man she loves, while the disparity between their financial situations could hardly be greater : Joie is totally destitute, without even the few treasures allowed to the two Fresnes.

---

(10) Cp. Mickel, art.cit. p.43 : "Le Fresne ... presents a love of charity which transcends all obstacles and suffering" and p.49: "Fresne's love...is...the transcending love or charity which includes the sacrifice of one's own happiness for the happiness of the loved one." The comparison with Griselda has also been made by, among others, C.Foulon, in his article "L'Ethique de Marie de France dans le lai de Fresne", Mélanges Lods (Paris 1978) vol.I, p.211 : "Avant le XIVe siècle, c'est l'humilité d'une sorte de Griselidis qui est ici considérée comme l'essentiel mérite de Fresne."

The emphasis on love can be seen in Joie's two monologues (lines 1682-1736, 1754-90), where her love-suffering is described at length. This double monologue, moreover, follows a passage in which Beaumanoir describes the origins and nature of love (1417-90), and it is clear that Joie's feelings are an illustration of the way in which love subjugates his servants and causes them to suffer (11). The importance of love, however, does not lead to the neglect of marriage. Indeed, the idea of love is inevitably associated with that of marriage in Joie's mind; she decides that her love is impossible, because marriage is impossible (1702-17). Moreover, Beaumanoir, like Renaut, wishes to make it clear that his heroine has a strict code of sexual morality, and he therefore lays particular emphasis on the fact that Joie does indeed desire marriage, and rejects concubinage :

1710      Dont pens je ce qui ne poet estre;  
              Que je ne serai ja sa femme,  
              Et j'ameroie miex en flame  
              Ardoir que fuisse sa soignant.

---

(11) Beaumanoir's analysis of love is similar to that given by Andreas at the start of the De Amore, as the following summary will indicate : i. the heart is led into love by the eyes (1417-50); ii. love leads to suffering (1451-6; these two points follow each other in De Amore cap.I, "Quid sit amor"); iii. the origin of the name of love (1457-62; cp. De Amore cap.III, "Unde dicatur amor"); iv. love gives hope, which strengthens lovers to bear their sufferings (1463-70; cp. Andreas' statement in cap.IV that love creates virtues in the lover); v. Love is unjust (1471-84; cp. De Amore cap. IV, inaequale pensum sua solet manu gestare); vi. love causes manifold suffering (1485-90 -- a consequence of love's injustice which is also implied at the end of cap. IV of the De Amore).

Thus Beaumanoir shows that Joie is deeply in love with the king of Scotland, and that this love is the source of her desire for union with him — a union which, for a girl of her high principles, can only mean marriage. Not once, however, does she refer to the fact that such a marriage would make her rich; she sees both love and marriage in terms of honour and rank, and speaks of herself as a lowly creature whom the king will ennoble, not as a pauper whom he will enrich. She is pleased that Love has made her fix her affections on so high-born a man :

1782      Amours a tort mais blasmerois  
             Car de son non m'a honoree  
             Et en si haute amour menee,  
             Que ele me fait roi amer.

Although she knows she is a princess, she tells the king himself that she is too lowly to marry him:

1958      Sire, ce n'est mie avenant  
             Que vous si vostre cuer plaissiés  
             Que dusk'a moi vous abaissiés,  
             Car je n'afier a vous de riens.

The honour of his proposal is such that it would be very hard for her if she had after all to give up the chance of marrying him :

1971      S'en tele honneur estoie entree,  
             Griés m'en seroit la consiurree.  
             Pour chou me vaut mix a bas tendre  
             Que haut baer pour bas descendre.

Yet she doesn't refuse him, for it would be excessively proud of her to reject such an honour :

1975      Nepourquant pas ne vous refus.  
              De grant orguer seroit temus  
              Mes cuers, se de vous s'escusoit  
              Et si grant honeur refusoit.

Indeed, in Joïe's reaction to the king's proposal, we find that the prime consideration is that of rank and honour. Even love itself is overlooked by Joïe in her anxiety to show that she is sensible of the great honour being done her, and in her horror of appearing presumptuous. Behind this anxiety, we may detect Beaumanoir's desire to convince us that his heroine is not a fortune-hunter. He makes Joïe accept the proposal with the utmost circumspection and humility, in order to avoid giving the impression that she leaps eagerly at the change of a rich and powerful husband (12).

Joïe is the last of our four heroines who love men of higher rank than themselves, and eventually marry them. We can see that in each case, the author makes it clear that altruistic love is the heroine's main motive force. Moreover, in contrast with most of the authors who wrote of heroes making rich marriages, two of our four authors make it abundantly clear that the heroine is interested in marriage.

---

(12) Beaumanoir's success in showing that Joïe is materially disinterested is highlighted by a few lines in the king's earlier soliloquy: "Ja n'a il femme en tout le mont,/Qui ne soit assés honnourée,/S'ele est roïne couronnée./Comment refuseroit couronne/Povre femme, se on li donne?" (1644-8). Clearly, Beaumanoir intended to contrast the king's slightly cynical expectation, as expressed here, with the reality of Joïe's sophistication and delicacy in accepting his proposal, and the contrast has been most successfully achieved,

Finally, we should perhaps note that all these heroines face, in one way or another, the problem of pre-marital sexual relations. Since this is far from being a problem which is raised in every romance, it is remarkable that it should occur in all four cases where a poor heroine loves a man of wealth, power and status. One might suggest that we see here a literary reflection of the real defencelessness of orphaned girls. Deprived of the protecting mainburnie of father or brother, such girls could all too easily be seduced, like Marie's Fresne, by a young nobleman promising that :

287      Certes, jamés ne vus faudrai,  
              Richement vus cunseilleraï.

Seen in the context of such exploitation, the fears of Renaut and Beaumanoir for their heroines' virtue are all too understandable.

In considering the works in which the poor heroine is not in love with the rich man she marries, we must ask ourselves whether the authors of these works were as concerned as Marie, Renaut, Beaumanoir or the author of Floire to show that their heroine is not motivated by greed. Does the heroine's attitude to marriage become more frankly materialistic in works where the author is not trying to present her as an admirably selfless lover? Since Jean Renart is more frank than other writers when, in L'Escoufle, he deals openly with Guillaume's material and social gains from marrying Aelis, we might expect to find a similarly realistic tone in Guillaume de Dole, where Ilenor, the povre orfenine, marries an emperor.

Certainly, there is no question in Guillaume de Dole of Jean Renart demonstrating his heroine's disinterestedness by making her appear indifferent to her marriage with Conrad. She is frankly very eager for the marriage to take place. On hearing that she has lost the chance of becoming empress, she sets out at once to vindicate her honour and recover the lost opportunity. Not only does she energetically organise the trial which will prove her innocence and her right to Conrad's love, but also, having proved the falsity of the seneschal's accusation, she boldly insists on her entitlement to the position of empress (5088-93, quoted *on next page*).

This brief summary might well give the impression that Liënor is a calculating adventuress, bent on making her fortune through marriage. That Jean Renart in fact manages to avoid creating any such impression is a measure of his skill, and in particular of his successful portrayal of the character of Liënor. Renart uses two main techniques to clear his heroine of the taint of cupidity. Firstly, he consistently refers to the honour, rather than to the wealth, of the marriage, and links it to the honourable quality of proëce in Guillaume, which is rewarded by the ennoblement of his sister through marriage. Secondly, he emphasises the altruism of Liënor's motives, showing that she does not want the marriage so much for herself as for the sake of Guillaume and her family (13).

---

(13) Liënor's unselfishness, which is such a marked trait of her character, is not commented on by Mme R. Lejeune in her study L'Oeuvre de Jean Renart (Liège 1935), where she discusses Liënor on p.70.



Let us examine first the way in which Jean Renart emphasises honour in connexion with Lïenor's marriage. Both her union with Conrad, and the empire whose lady she will become as a result of that union, are frequently referred to as honor in Guillaume de Dole (14). Conrad twice describes Lïenor as being worthy of the honor of being empress (2986-7, 3094-5); Guillaume uses the word honor to refer both to the empire and to the honour of Lïenor's marriage (3718); Lïenor herself, in claiming the right to marry Conrad, uses the word onor:

5088        Se l'onor et la segnorie  
              De cest regne m'est destinee,  
              Ceste lasse, ceste exploree,  
              Quant ele fet n'a la deserte,  
 5092        Por quel reson i avra perte?  
              De ce demant a la cort droit.

This emphasis on the honour of marrying an emperor completely eclipses any idea of the riches to be gained through such a marriage. Indeed, it is noticeable that Renart does not use terms like richece or manatise in this connexion at all. Moreover, the honour of becoming empress is seen as a reward for the honourable quality of vasselage in Guillaume (2976-7) and for Lïenor's own exemplary goodness and beauty (3012-9). Renart thus seems to be deliberately

---

(14) Although it is not always easy to distinguish between onor as an abstract quality (TL "Ehre, Ansehn, Ruhm, Glanz") and onor as a material possession or function (TL "Besitztum, Herrschaft, Lehen; Regierung, hohes...Amt"), Renart's use of the word in this romance seems on the whole to reflect the former rather than the latter meaning. See, for example, the way in which onor is contrasted with honte in the dialogue between Guillaume and his nephew (3806-3855), and the implied distinction between onor=gloire and onor=fief in the phrase "l'onor...de ceste regne" (5088-9). I have not found a semantic study of the use of onor in the thirteenth century; such a study would be most rewarding, and might shed light on the interesting findings of G.S.Burgess, who, discussing the use of onor in the period up to 1160, concludes that the sense onor=gloire was a relatively tardy development, and that "L'honneur n'est jamais une qualité morale pure, une attitude d'esprit, un sentiment intérieur"; instead, it is "quelque chose de possédé, que l'on donne et que l'on reçoit." (Contribution à l'Etude du Vocabulaire Pré-Courtois, Geneva 1970, p.89).

associating Lïenor's marriage with ideas of honour, nobility and noble conduct, and dissociating it from that of wealth.

Lïenor's own attitude to the relative merits of wealth and rank is suggested by Renart in the charming scene where Guillaume gives her the emperor's gold seal. Instead of admiring the richness of the seal, Lïenor comments on the fact that it bears the emperor's portrait:

1067       ...or doi mout estre lie  
Quant j'ai un roi de ma mesnie.

Slight in itself, this remark is given significance by the half-serious way in which both Guillaume (3667-80) and the couple's mother (1010-3) see it as a prophecy of Lïenor's future status. Perhaps we may also see significance in the fact that, in this "prophecy", Lïenor is interested in the high rank of her future husband, and not in his great wealth.

Other facets of Lïenor's character also help to demonstrate that she is not a mercenary young woman. In particular, Jean Renart emphasises the unselfishness of her motives for wanting to marry Conrad. In resolving to go and vindicate herself at Mainz, Lïenor is not so much concerned for her own advancement as for that of her family and followers :

4042       S'ele pert le grant segnorage  
Si come d'estre empereriz,  
Bien les a toz morz et traïz  
Par son engin li seneschaus.

All Liënor wants for herself is to clear her good name; the possibility of her marrying the emperor as a result of such a justification is seen almost as a secondary concern, and one whose merit will, above all, be that of restoring health and happiness to her mother and brother (4026-41, 4046-57). At this time of crisis, Liënor's thoughts are mainly for other people. Putting on a brave front which hides her doubts and distress (4036-7), she sets out to do something positive about their situation, and

4060        Par son grant sens ravigora  
               Sa mere et toz ceuz de l'ostel.

Above all, she is concerned for her brother, who has been reported as being at death's door. She sees Conrad's offer of marriage as being entirely due to her brother's merit, ignoring any quality of hers which might have prompted the emperor's decision, and sheds tears of pity for Guillaume's bitter disappointment, not for her own loss of an empire (4628-37). In an earlier passage, we see Renart again being careful to point out that Liënor's tears are not for the loss of such a rich marriage, but for the damage to her own reputation and for the potentially mortal blow to the happiness of her brother and mother:

4265        Lermes plus cleres d'eve rose  
               Li couroient aval le vis,  
               Car c'est torz, ce li est avis:  
               Se Dex n'i fet miracle aperte,  
 4269        I puet a double estre la perte,  
               Et de s'onor et de son frere.  
               Li cuers li dieult trop de sa mere,  
               Por coi cez larmes issent fors.

Since these tears are apparently provoked by the reminder that Conrad has come to Mainz in order to announce his marriage (4253-60), Renart's insistence in lines 4271-2 that Lïenor is weeping for her mother seems to spring from a determination on his part to make it clear that his heroine's motives are entirely selfless.

Thus Jean Renart did indeed seek to show that Lïenor is not a fortune-hunter, even though she does not love Conrad. Indeed, he succeeds particularly well in creating a heroine who, though she quite deliberately sets out on a course of action which will lead to her marrying an emperor, can in no way be described as mercenary. Lïenor's rich marriage is seen primarily as a great honour to which, with her surpassing beauty and virtue, she can legitimately aspire, and her chief reasons for seeking the marriage are shown to be entirely devoid both of cupidity and even of person<sup>al</sup> ambition. For herself, she seeks only to vindicate her reputation; she seeks the resulting marriage for the sake of her household and family, especially the beloved brother to whose good qualities she attributes her own chance of becoming empress. One cannot, however, leave Lïenor without reflecting that Jean Renart himself may well have enjoyed the irony of the fact that her "unselfish" action is nevertheless designed to bring her a "selfish" advantage. Such a paradoxical attitude to his heroine would be typical of Jean Renart's generally quizzical view of the world and of his own creations.

Another heroine who marries an emperor without being in love with him is Athanaïs, in Gautier d'Arras' Eracle. Gautier frankly envisages the marriage as conferring both riches and rank on his heroine; he emphasises the state of poverty in which Eracle finds her, drawing attention to her old clothes (2577-8) and to the fact that she is a defenceless orphan, with no-one to provide for her but her aunt (2579-81, 2611-5). The aunt herself makes it clear that the marriage represents an undreamt-of improvement in Athanaïs' fortunes :

2760 Niece, ne pués or monter plus!  
Onques encor, se Dieus me salt,  
Ne fist nule si riche salt.  
Il n'ot plus povre en ceste honor,  
2764 Or aras un empereor.

However, Gautier is careful to show that Athanaïs does not accept this windfall in a spirit of greed or pride. In answer to her aunt's admonition to treat her good fortune as God's gift, to be used in His service, she replies :

2773 Ante, se Dieus me face aïe,  
Je ne serai trop esbahie  
Ne trop par riqueche avulee;  
Forment seroie desjuglee  
2777 Se a Dieu ne savoie rendre  
Çou qu'il m'a doné por despendre.  
S'il ne m'eüst riens commandé,  
Riens ne me seroit demandé,  
2781 Mais il m'a doné tot mon bien  
Sel servirai de es le sien.

Thus Gautier, like the other authors we have been considering, seems to be concerned to make it clear that his heroine is not

acting from mercenary motives when she makes a rich marriage.

Where other writers emphasise that the heroine's motive is disinterested love for the hero, or her unselfish concern for her family, Gautier, in a work celebrating the finding of the True Cross, prefers to stress the heroine's piety. The little dialogue between Athanaïs and her aunt is intended to show that the heroine, mindful of the parable of the talents, accepts her enrichment through marriage in a spirit of devout humility, conscious of her duties as a steward of God's splendid gifts.

For contrast, let us now turn to a work in which the author is not in the least concerned to show his heroine's disinterestedness: Guillaume d'Angleterre (15). The heroine of this story, Gratiene, is queen of England at the beginning of the tale, but at the time of the marriage in which we are interested she is destitute. She marries a man richer than herself because she frankly wants his riches and status, and Chrestien almost deliberately heightens the mercenary aspect of this marriage by making it a demotion in terms of social status for Gratiene, and by making the husband elderly and unattractive. Thus Gratiene's only reason for marrying is to gain control of her husband's wealth; her marriage does not bring her high rank, nor is her husband a young, handsome man like Conrad or Laïs, with whom the audience of a romance would expect her to be happy, if not actually in love. A brief examination of

---

(15) I believe that there is good reason to doubt the attribution of Guillaume d'Angleterre to Chrétien de Troyes, as is indicated in Jean Frappier's discussion of the topic in Chrétien de Troyes (Paris 1968), pp.75-81.

Gratiene's marriage, then, will ~~exactly~~ show us precisely the kind of mercenary approach that the writers of the other works we have examined tried to hard to avoid, and will help us better to appreciate the skill with which these other writers created heroines who, though marrying rich men, are in no sense fortune-hunters.

Chrestien is quite explicit about Gratiene's mercenary motives. Her future husband, Gleolaïs, explains to her at length that she will be his sole heir after his death (1095-1103), and this argument provides Gratiene's one reason for agreeing to the marriage:

1188	Bel li seroit qu'ele fust dame De le terre, coi c'avenist, Ensi c'après lui le tenist, Que ja estoit kemus et vix;
1192	Et, d'autre part, revauroit mix Estre arse et a cevax traite Que de son cors li eüst faite Carnelment mule compaignie.
1196	L'un veut et l'autre ne veut mie. Le terre veut, de lui n'a cure.

Apart from the attraction of his lands, Gleolaïs has no interest for her. She looks on him as a social inferior :

1108	Membre li qu'ele fu roïne, Or seroit feme a un baron: Trop aroit avillié son non.
------	---

Moreover, she cannot possibly love him; not only is he kemus et vix, but she is in any case determined to remain faithful to her lost husband, with whom she was deeply in love (39-40, 1111-7).

Gleolaïs' followers have no doubt about their new lady's reasons for making the match:

1264 Nus ne l'esgarde ne ne voit  
 Qui ne die : "N'est mie sote  
 Ceste; mais mesire rasote:  
 Certes, s'onques feme connui,  
 1268 Prent le terre, ne mie lui".

Thus Gratiene's behaviour all too easily lends itself to the cynical interpretation, and we seem to hear, in the remarks of Gleolaïs' people, the sort of comment which other authors strove to make inapplicable to their own heroines.

Nevertheless, the reader of Guillaume d'Angleterre is not left with an unfavourable image of Gratiene. Indeed, her hard-headed approach to matrimony is almost a virtue, since it is dictated by her over-riding wish to remain faithful to Guillaume, and Chrestien deliberately emphasises the mercenary aspect of this marriage in order to show that there is no question of his heroine loving anyone but the hero, her rightful husband. He draws attention to Gratiene's scruples when she first receives Gleolaïs' proposal :

1112 ...ains se laira bruller ou tondre  
 Que ja mais en cele maniere,  
 Ne por force ne por proiere,  
 Ne por terre ne por avoir,  
 1116 Voelle ami ne signor avoir,  
 Se le sien meisme nen a.

This intransigent fidelity is later seen to be mainly a question of not wishing to engage in sexual relations with anyone but the lost Guillaume, and Chrestien speaks admiringly of the trick by which



Gratiene gets a rich husband while still preserving her chastity (1184-7, 1203-48). Thus we have in Guillaume d'Angleterre the paradox of a romance whose author, in order to emphasise the purity of his heroine's love for the hero, makes it quite plain that her only motive for making a rich marriage is a mercenary one. This, of course, is the exact opposite of the procedure adopted in romances where the rich husband is himself the hero, and where the heroine's love for him must be seen to be untainted by cupidity.

A second reason why Gratiene's conduct does not appear despicable is that marrying for money is a practical, sensible course for her to take — indeed, the only practical alternative, in her destitute condition. Like Marie's Fresne, and indeed like Lienor, Gratiene is perhaps a truer reflection of the realities of life in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries than heroines who, like Renaut's Fresne or the Manekine, expect to marry rich men for love alone. In the favourable treatment of Gratiene's mercenary marriage, we see an example of the practical, property-oriented medieval view of matrimony, in which a woman had every right to make a "good" marriage without anyone expecting her to be romantically in love with the man concerned. This view contrasts with the idealised picture found in such works as Galeran de Bretagne, where the woman still makes a good marriage, but where the match is presented as the outcome of disinterested romantic love, and social and financial gains are no part of her purpose in marrying.

As we have already noted, the practical and the romantic views of marriage co-exist in many romances, and seem to reflect two parallel sets of values in the feudal public for whom these romances were written.

Finally, let us turn to Chrétien's Enide, surely the best-known of the heroines who marry above their station. Consideration of Enide has been postponed until this point because it is not easy to classify her in either of the two categories we have adopted for poor heroines who marry well : those who are in love with their future husband, and those who are not. Enide, for her part, is not in love with Erec when he first asks for her hand, but has fallen very much in love with him by the time the marriage takes place. Under both circumstances, however, her attitude parallels that of the other heroines we have examined, and thus a comparison with these others may perhaps enable us to see Enide's attitude in a new light.

When Enide first hears that she is to marry Erec, her attitude is one of great pleasure at her good fortune :

684      Et la pucele ert tote coie,  
           Mes molt estoit joianz et liee  
           Qu'ele li estoit otroiee,  
           Por ce que preuz ert et cortois,  
 688      Et bien savoit qu'il seroit rois  
           Et ele meisme enoree,  
           Riche reine coronee.

There is no suggestion here that Enide has fallen in love with Erec at first sight, as he does with her. Rather, the absence of any mention of Enide's appreciation of Erec's good looks shows that,

at this stage, love has not yet entered her heart. Her pleasure at being allotted to Erec stems from the fact that he has admirable personal qualities (preuz ert et cortois), <sup>and</sup> also that marriage to him represents a magnificent rise in the social scale.

Enide, however, keeps her pleasure to herself, and many critics have drawn attention to the fact that, at this turning-point in her life, she remains silent, almost a spectator of the events rather than a chief participant (16). Her silence and passivity are, indeed, important pointers to her gentle, submissive character, and it is indeed a significant indication of contemporary customs that, as Gustave Cohen puts it, "le consentement de la jeune fille, chose tout à fait secondaire semble-t-il, n'a été sollicité ni par le père ni par le prétendant." (17). We are here, however, concerned rather with the exact nature of her reaction to Erec's marriage-demand than with the fact that her reaction is neither sought by others nor expressed to them.

One scholar who has commented on the aspect which interests us was Mme Lot-Borodine. Comparing Chrétien's and Hartmann von Aue's versions of the episode, she remarks that :

Hartmann avec beaucoup de tact a négligé de nous montrer son héroïne se réjouir à la pensée d'être reine, car une ambition semblable ne cadre pas avec le caractère d'Enide.(18)

---

(16) Among more recent commentators who refer to Enide's silence are Jean Frappier (Chrétien de Troyes, Paris 1968, p.88), G.J.Brogyanyi ("Motivation in Erec et Enide", Kentucky Romance Quarterly 19 (1972) pp.412-3) and Z.Zaddy (Chrétien Studies, Glasgow 1973, pp.28-9). For all these writers, Enide's silence is important as a sign of the passivity or submissiveness which characterise her at this stage in the romance.

(17) Chrétien de Troyes et son Oeuvre (Paris 1931), p.121.

(18) La Femme et l'Amour au XIIe Siècle (Paris 1909), p.39, note 1.

Mme Lot-Borodine seems here to be voicing the very charges of ambition and fortune-hunting against which authors of romances, as we have seen, tried to protect their heroines. However, we have also seen that it was not always "tactless" for a heroine of twelfth or thirteenth century romance to express satisfaction over the prospect of becoming a great noblewoman through marriage. Indeed, in cases where the heroine, like Enide, is not in love with the hero, authors seem to feel no need to disguise her interest in becoming the wife of a prince or an emperor. Enide's pleasure in her fortunate marriage is no more ambitious or unsuitable than that of Llenor or Athanaïs, both of whom are presented as heroines who are very glad to make rich marriages. We can see, moreover, that Chrétien, like Renaut or Jean Renart, takes care to emphasise the honour of his heroine's marriage, and to show that this great honour is a due reward for her surpassing beauty and virtues. Thus Enide's father has earlier been at pains to point out that his daughter deserves to become a queen or a countess through marriage :

533      A dons soz ciel ne roi ne conte  
             Qui eüst de ma fille honte,  
             Qui tant var est bele a mervoille  
             Qu'an ne puet trover sa paroille?  
 537      Molt est bele, mes mialz asez  
             Vaut ses savoirs que sa biautez :  
             Onques Dex ne fist rien tant saige  
             Ne qui tant soit de franc coraige.

The reference to God in line 539 as the creator of Enide's virtues gives added weight to the idea that one so perfect deserves to be honoured. Indeed, the old vavassor expects that God Himself will

see to it that this perfect creature gains the high status she deserves :

529        Mes j'atant encor meillor point,  
              Que Dex greignor enor li doint,  
              Que avanture li amaint  
              Ou roi ou conte qui l'an maint.

Thus Enide's splendid marriage is no more than the honour which was clearly her due, and this notion of virtue rewarded is reinforced by the suggestion that God Himself has both created the virtues and seen to it that they will be honoured by a suitably high station in life.

Moreover, we notice that Enide herself is particularly impressed by the fact that her marriage will bring her great honour. Although she is far too humble to believe, as her father does, that such honour is no more than her due, she nevertheless sees it as one of the chief benefits of her marriage to Erec, as we see in the last three lines of the passage already quoted :

688        Et bien savoit qu'il seroit rois  
              Et ele meisme enoree  
              Riche reine coronee.

The same intense awareness of the honour of marrying Erec, heightened by her low estimation of her own merits, is found in Enide's account of her marriage given to her disconsolate cousin at Brandigan (6258-62, quoted on p. 507 below).

It therefore seems somewhat misleading to suggest, as Mme Lot-Borodine does, that Enide's attitude to her marriage displays an unsuitably ambitious side to her nature. Enide's pleasure at becoming a queen through marriage is not a sign of unseemly ambition, but rather a delighted gratitude at the great honour her marriage will confer on her. Chrétien would hardly have gone out of his way to show his heroine in a bad light by thus revealing an ambitious streak, and we can see that, for him, marriage to a prince is above all an honour for his heroine — an honour of which it is natural and right that she should be sensible.

Enide's initial reaction to the news of her marriage is, as we have pointed out, that of a girl who is not yet in love. Very soon, however, she begins to fall deeply in love with her splendid young fiancé. Her loving concern and admiration for him are already seen during and after the battle with Yder (890-4, 1300-2), and as they ride to Arthur's court her feelings are no less full of wondering love than Erec's own (1478-83). It is interesting to note that, as Enide's love develops, Chrétien no longer finds it necessary to tell us what she thinks about her approaching marriage. Like so many of his fellow-authors at this period, Chrétien assumes we will take it for granted that, loving Erec as she does, Enide is delighted to marry him. Only at their first meeting, when Enide had not yet fallen in love, was it

necessary for Chrétien to explain specifically that she is pleased at the prospect of marrying Erec; once love has taken root, there is no further need for such self-evident truths to be stated. Chrétien is now interested in showing us the strength of his heroine's love, which will be a key element of the second part of his romance, and with demonstrating the couple's fundamental equality in virtue and beauty, which far outweighs the superficial differences in rank and fortune. Thus Enide, when in love with the young prince she is to marry, may be compared with Blanche-flor; the emphasis is placed mainly on her love, and we are told nothing about her attitude to her forthcoming marriage.

Our final information about Enide's attitude is given when she recalls the circumstances of her marriage for the benefit of her cousin at Brandigan. Here, her attitude is dictated largely by her desire to suggest to this disconsolate relative that her liaison with Maboagrain might have had a happier outcome if it had been conducted in a more socially acceptable way. Hence Enide stresses particularly that her union with Erec was a marriage known of and approved by all her family, including the count of Leluth, the most important man in their family group (6242-7) (19). Here we are reminded, by Enide herself, of the fact that she own consent to the marriage was of insignificant weight compared with that of her parents and relatives, and,

---

(19) Enide's remarks provide further evidence of the importance of the amis charnels in the arrangement of a marriage; she specifically mentions the knowledge and consent not only of her parents, but of "tuit...nostre parant", and singles out the count's approval in line 6247.

with the example of Enide's cousin before us, we perhaps see more clearly why people in the middle ages gave such importance to parental consent in these matters (20). As well as this essential difference between her own situation and that of her cousin, Enide also emphasises the similarities in their positions, in order to show how relevant her example is to her cousin's behaviour. Thus she points out that Erec (like Maboagrain) is a knight of exceptional valour (6248-53), and that she and Erec (like her cousin and Maboagrain) are deeply in love (6254-5). The mention of love then leads Enide on to a topic which is not strictly relevant to her cousin's situation : that of the great honour Erec did her in making her his wife, for which she has every reason to love him:

6256      Onques ancor ne me soi faindre  
              De lui amer, ne je ne doi :  
              Voir, mes sires est filz de roi,  
              Et si me prist et povre et mue;  
 6260      Par lui m'est tex enors creüe  
              Qu'ainz a nule desconseilliee  
              Ne fu si granz apareilliee.

Thus Enide's love for Erec, which for a time obscured her other reactions to her marriage, is now seen to be bound up with her sense of wondering humility and gratitude that someone so splendid

---

(20) It is interesting to note that some Renaissance thinkers were, if anything, even more insistent on parental consent than those of the "unenlightened" middle ages: see M.A.Screech's edition of Rabelais' Tiers Livre (Geneva 1964), pp.317-325 and notes to lines 24, 34, 120 and 146 of this chapter of the Tiers Livre; and also M.A.Screech, The Rabelaisian Marriage, (London 1958), pp.44-54.



should chose her, povre et mue, for such honour. As Frappier puts it, Enide is "pénétrée d'amour, de reconnaissance et d'une admiration quasi superstitieuse pour ce 'fils de roi' devenu soudain son fiancé." (21). Chrétien, as we have seen, concentrates on Enide's love once this emotion has taken root in her heart, but he still means it to be understood that Enide's initial pleasure at her good fortune, and gratitude to Erec, are important elements in her attitude to her marriage and, indeed,<sup>in</sup> the growth of her love itself (22).

As a result of this analysis, in which we have compared Enide with other heroines who marry above their station, we are able to see clearly how Chrétien has charted the development of his heroine's feelings. Her love for Erec grows gradually; she does not fall instantly in love as soon as she meets him. Instead, her reactions at their first meeting are very similar to those of other heroines who are not in love with the rich and noble young men they marry: she is delighted at the prospect of making such a fine match. Far from considering such delight to be an unsuitable emotion, Chrétien takes care to let his audience know that Enide is pleased at the

---

(21) Chrétien de Troyes, (Paris 1968), p.88.

(22) A further function in the romance of Enide's awareness of her good fortune is suggested by a remark of John F. Plummer in his article "Bien dire and bien aprendre in Chrétien de Troyes' Erec et Enide", Romania XCV (1974), p.389: "Enide has escaped only recently from poverty, and is quite sensible of the honor and wealth which has been given to her. [In the scene at Limors] the implied temptation to hold her peace, to take the good fortune thrust upon her without being overly scrupulous, must be seen as an intentional contrivance on Chrétien's part." Although one may well doubt whether the count's behaviour really tempts Enide to hold her peace, the possibility of a contrast between the two marriages, both of which offer Enide an escape from poverty but only one of which offers happiness, may well have been part of Chrétien's intention in the Limors episode.

thought of becoming a riche reine through marriage. However, like other authors whose heroines express frankly their pleasure at such opportunities for wealth and status through marriage, Chrétien is careful to avoid portraying his heroine as a materialistic fortune-hunter. Like Ikenor's unselfishness or Athanaïs' piety, Enide's humility wards off any such impression. Moreover, Chrétien, like Renaut or Jean Renart, concentrates on the rank rather than the riches which his heroine will gain through marriage, and shows that such ennoblement is no more than the just reward of her virtues. Later, as Enide sees more of Erec, her initially favourable impression of him personally (she had found him preuz et cortois on first meeting him) deepens into a heartfelt love. As a loving bride, Enide's reactions are again similar to those of other heroines - heroines who, like Blanche-flor, are overwhelmingly in love with the young princes they marry. Love itself becomes the centre of interest, and the girl's opinion of her change of status through marriage seems so irrelevant that the author does not trouble to spell it out for us. At the end of the romance, however, we see that Enide's initial pleasure and wonderment at her good fortune were not lost when love became the dominant emotion; she tells us herself that she remained, and remains, intensely aware of the magnificent honour which marriage to Erec brought her. This awareness, however, is far from being a sign of ambition; instead, it illuminates Enide's humility, a key to her conduct in the crisis which threatens her marriage.

In conclusion, we may perhaps say that the most striking characteristic of the heroines who marry above their station is the frankness with which most of them express their interest in making such good marriages. We might have expected that heroines who anticipate social and material gains through marriage would be as discrete about their matrimonial hopes as are heroes in the same situation. On examination, however, we find that only Blanchefflor and Marie's Fresne make no mention of their desire for marriage, and only in Blanchefflor's case is this reticence attributable to the author's wish to present his heroine as an ideal lover, who does not spare a thought for anything but love itself. Marie's Fresne is a more complex figure; an ideally unselfish woman, ready to sacrifice everything for the happiness of the man she loves, and giving no thought to her own chances of happiness or worldly success through marriage. The other heroines we have examined in this chapter are all quite frank and explicit about their interest in marriage, and in this they contrast with heroes who make similarly advantageous matches. An impoverished heroine will freely declare that she longs for marriage with the rich lord she loves, or show that she is very happy to become an empress or a queen through marriage, even where she is not actually in love with the man concerned; an impoverished hero who loves a princess will rarely be found to express any positive interest in marriage.

It would seem, then, that authors were more concerned to protect heroes than heroines from the taint of materialism and ambition. One notes, however, that authors are careful, where appropriate, to emphasise their heroine's love as the main reason why she hopes for marriage, and tend to stress the honour to be gained by marrying a prince rather than the material gains of such a marriage. In both these ways, authors show that they realise their heroines could be open to charges of cupidity, and are concerned to eliminate the possibility of such charges being levelled. Thus heroines, like heroes, must clearly be seen to be above sordid material considerations.

The difference in treatment does, however, suggest that it was much easier for an author to present his heroine in such an ideal light than his hero. A young man who made his fortune through marriage was, apparently, more likely to be accused of mercenary motives than a young woman who followed the same course, and therefore authors had to go to much greater lengths to protect the reputation of their heroes.

One may speculate as to the possible social origins of this literary phenomenon: was the public, perhaps, especially cynical about the motives of young men who claim to be madly in love with rich heiresses? No doubt there was more than one young adventurer who, like Arnould d'Ardres wooing the Countess of Boulogne, "*ad terram tamen et Boloniensis comitatus dignitatem, veri vel simulati*

amoris objectu, recuperata ejusdem comitis gratia, aspiravit" (23).

Young women, on the other hand, with less freedom to arrange their own marriages, were also less likely to be suspected of underlying mercenary motives. Such speculation, however, is outside the scope of this thesis; our purpose here is simply to draw attention to the fact that most writers of romances in twelfth and thirteenth century France did not consider it unseemly for a heroine to express a positive interest in a marriage by which she would become a great and wealthy noblewoman.

---

(23) Lambert d'Ardres, Historia Comitum Ghisnensium, 93, quoted by G. Duby in his article "Dans la France du Nord-Ouest au XIIe siècle : les 'jeunes' dans la société aristocratique", Annales — Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations XIX (1964) p.846. I have already drawn attention to this quotation from Lambert d'Ardres on p.139 above (Part III, Chapter 1).

## Chapter 5. The Heroine's Attitude to a Suitor of Lower Rank.

---

We have already remarked frequently on the fact that, in many of our romances, the heroine is of higher rank than the hero. We have seen that this discrepancy in rank may cause problems for the hero; it is now time to see what problems the same discrepancy may create for the heroine, and how she solves them.

The romance which gives most attention to such difference of rank from the heroine's point of view is Florimont. In this work we are given not only the conflicting ideas of the heroine herself, but also the views of her maistresce, of her mother (1), and of "Amor" and "Sapience" (2). The point at issue is whether or not a

---

- (1) As the editor of Florimont, A. Hilka, points out, the function of the heroine's mother, who divines the true cause of her daughter's "malady" and argues against her choice of a lover, is the same as that of Lavinia's mother in Eneas. The maistresce, Sipriaigne, may be compared with Fenice's mestre, Thessala, in Cligès; she too is called after her place of origin, and guesses the cause of her charge's love-sickness. These similarities are mentioned by Hilka on pp. CXIII and CXXXVII-CXXXVIII of the introduction to his edition of Florimont. A further similarity between Thessala and Sipriaigne is that both use stratagems to bring about the union of the lovers; see Cligès 3156 ff., 5340 ff., 5652 ff., 6540 ff., and Florimont 8505 ff.
- (2) These personifications are a method of dramatising the heroine's interior debate. Hilka has found many other examples of the use of this technique in twelfth and thirteenth century romances; see his edition of Florimont, p. CXXXVII. A particularly close parallel with the debate in Florimont is provided by the debate between Amors and Sans in Athis et Prophilias; in each case, the heroine is hesitating between a rich but unloved suitor and the poor man she loves.

princess should love — and hence, by implication, hope to marry — a man of considerably lower rank than herself. The difference in rank is very sharp: Romadanaple is a great heiress, while the man she loves is a penniless adventurer of unknown origins, calling himself Li Povres Perdus. Although the audience knows that the Povre Perdu is Florimont, the son of a duke, Romadanaple and her circle are in complete ignorance about his background.

The basic argument against Romadanaple's love is very simple: she should not love beneath her, because she is of such high birth:

7305      Puel que je sui fille de roi,  
              Ne doi ameir plus baix de moi.

This idea is repeated by the Queen (7869-70), and by Sipriaigne, Romadanaple's maistresce, together with its corollary, that she should love her equal:

7619      Car se tu ais d'amer coraige,  
              Et de biaté et de paraige  
              Sai ge bien que tu dois amer.  
              Se de biaté trueves ton peir,  
7623      Ne dois amer sens ton paroil,  
              Se tu wels croire mon consoil;  
              Que plus bais de roi ou de conte  
              Ne poroies ameir sens honte.

This passage is not entirely clear, and it is interesting that all the mss. of Florimont, except the two on which Hilka's edition is based, have amer or amors for biaté in line 7622. This variant, however, does not seem to me to increase the clarity of the passage, since it introduces a totally new idea, that of equality in love, for which the reader is quite unprepared. On the other

hand, Romadanaple's surpassing beauty has been sufficiently commented on in the course of the romance for the reader to expect some reference to her finding her equal in this quality. I would therefore accept the reading of Hilka's edition, but would prefer to alter his punctuation, since it seems to me that the passage reads more coherently if one puts lines 7620-7622 in brackets, with no full stop after line 7621, as a parenthesis inserted into the main sentence. It then becomes clearer that Sipriaigne is insisting on equality of birth, while mentioning equality of beauty incidentally, as an asset which Romadanaple is in any case unlikely to find in any lover:

7619	Car se tu ais d'amer coraige (Et de biaté et de paraige Sai ge bien que tu dois amer, Se de biaté trueves ton peir)
7623	Ne dois amer sens ton paroil, Se tu wels croire mon consoil...

There are other variants on this theme of the unsuitability of an unequal love. For example, Sipriaigne maintains that it would be folie for Romadanaple to love beneath her (7705-8), and that, if she was a sensible girl (saige), she would refuse to harbour love towards the unknown Povre Perdu (7639-41; 7646-9). Romadanaple herself, in the early stages of her love, thinks that she is fole to be interested in the Povre Perdu; indeed, any love is folie for one in her position (5675-88).

Loving or marrying beneath one are also associated with ideas of shame and debasement, though, as with the folly of such



a course, the exact nature of the association is not spelt out, but taken to be self-evident. As we have seen in lines 7625-6, quoted above, Sipriaigne describes love for an inferior as honte, and the Queen elaborates on the shamefulness of such love, pointing out that, if it reached the ears of Romadanaple's rejected but high-born suitor, the whole family would be put to shame (7871-3). This idea is closely linked with that of degradation; Romadanaple would demean (abaissier) herself and her family line by loving so basely (7646-9; 7869-70). Even Romadanaple, in her first reverie, feels she could be despised for deigning to love beneath her (5676-9).

The corollary of this idea that it is debasing to love an inferior is given by Sipriaigne : Romadanaple should love someone who will bring her honour (7687), which a povre chevelier will never do (7647-9). This argument also seems to underlie the analogy used by Sapience, who compares a rich and powerful king with the sea, which is great enough to support a ship loaded with merchandise (8986-95). Such a king, by implication, would support Romadanaple herself in a situation of greatness and power; he would, in effect, bring her honour.

The Queen and Sipriaigne also use arguments of a rather different nature from these variations on the themes of folly and dishonour. They point out the practical difficulties : Romadanaple's parents will be furious if she loves a povre (7685-8, 7709-12), and so will her whole family (7862-6); her father will hardly agree to

his only child marrying such a man (7931-4). Another practical consideration is that her father has already refused a far nobler suitor, the king of Hungary (3), and is currently at war with the rejected king as a result. It would be both highly embarrassing politically, and infuriating for Romadanaple's family in general, if it were known that the princess now loved a mere vavassor (7862-73).

Thus the case against loving an inferior is not so much an argument as a simple prohibition, reinforced by an association with the ideas of shame, folly and dishonour, and by a few practical considerations. The case in favour is both more complex, and more fully argued by its adherents -- Romadanaple and Amors. The statements that a princess should not love beneath her, and that it is shameful to do so, are met by the principle that love does choose its object on the grounds of rank or wealth:

---

(3) The rôle of the king of Hungary is Florimont is almost certainly an elaboration of the historical events of 1184-6, when king Bela III of Hungary asked for the hand of Philippe-Auguste's sister, Marguerite; the French court was amazed by the riches with which Bela supported his suit, and "marriage to the king of Hungary" became for a time the epitome of a marriage in which the bride gained much wealth, but little happiness. G. Luttrell comments on the echoes of this Hungarian marriage in both Florimont and Athis et Prophilias in The Creation of the First Arthurian Romance (London, 1974), pp.41-2, and Claude Buridant discusses Andreas Capellanus' use of the same events in the introduction to the French translation of the De Amore (André le Chapelain, Traité de l'Amour Courtois, Paris 1974, pp.9-11). Curiously, A.Fourrier, in Le Courant Réaliste (p.451 and note 20), neglects the influence of Bela's marriage to Marguerite on Florimont, while pointing out a rather more tenuous link between some earlier marriage-plans of Bela's with a Greek princess, and the enmity between the Hungarian and Greek kings in Florimont.

- 7537      Es livres ai d'amors trové  
             Que riens n'i pert per povreté,  
             Et ma maistresce si me di(s)t  
             Que bone amor[s]pas nen e[s]li(s)t;  
 7541      N'est pas loiaus quant welt eslire. (4)  
             A ma maistresce l'oï dire:  
             Ne halt ne baix, povre ne riche  
             Nen e[s]li(s)t amor[s] qui ne triche.

Romadanaple, having used this argument to convince herself, has recourse to it again in her dispute with her mother (7877-84), and finally it is reiterated by Amors, who adds that to choose a lover for his riches is not love, but avarice and covetousness, and will lead to sorrow (8962-74). This argument gains added point when linked by Aymon to the Ovidian concept of the irresistible might of love (5). Clearly, it is not Romadanaple's fault if she loves a poor knight, for

- 7643      Jai avez vos lut en l'actor  
             Que nus n'ait force contre amor

-- and love is not concerned with riches or status.

Since love is not determined by rank, it follows that good character is more important in matters of love than wealth or position:

---

(4) Hilka suggests (Introduction to Florimont, p.CXVIII) that this idea may be an echo of Ovid's Ars Amatoria II 161 ff. It seems possible, however, that this particular passage, with its mention of the livres d'amors (7537), harks back to the Amores, in which Ovid frequently refers to the iniquity of loving for riches (I viii passim; I x passim; III viii 1-10, 29-34 and 59-66). A particularly close parallel is furnished by Amores I iii 7-18, where Ovid declares that Love, the arts, and his virtues ought to earn him his mistress' favour, even though his family is poor, issued from a humble knight (equus), without great estates or ancient lineage. Line 7539 appears to be a proverb; see Morawski, Proverbes Français (Paris 1925) no.88: "Amors n'esleisent mie". This is not noted by Hilka.  
 (5) For this idea in Ovid, see, for example, Amores I i and ii. The tag "Omnia vincit amor", however, comes not from Ovid but from Virgil, Eclogues X 69.

7887 Plus ains boen povre sens richesce  
Que mavaïe baron per s'autesce,

says Romadanaple. Aymon illustrates this idea by two metaphors : one, used by Romadanaple, of the little spring which is more refreshing than a great stretch of water (7650-7) (6), and one used by Amors, of the apple tree which gives sweeter fruit than the mighty oak (8975-82). Furthermore, in the case of the Povre Perdu, his good qualities (7) are positively enhanced by his low rank:

7530 Se il est de petit paraige  
Povres de terre et d'avoir,  
Por ce doit grinor los avoir;  
Car a riche cuer et por pris  
7534 En est venus en cest país.

Indeed, if one considers the resources of his character rather than those of his purse, the Povre Perdu is, thinks Romadanaple, the best lover she could choose (7546-8).

---

(6) As Hilka points out (Florimont p.550, note to line 7651), this metaphor is probably an elaboration of the Old French proverb "A petite fontaine boit len soef" (Morawski, Proverbes Français, no.99). It is also interesting to note that this image is the first in a series of water metaphors used in Florimont during the debate over Romadanaple's love for an inferior: see also 11. 7909-15, 8989-9002). This imagery may have been inspired by Ovid, who makes frequent use of sea images; as well as the examples mentioned by Hilka (p.CXXXIV, §5), see also Ars Amatoria II 429-32; III 94, 259-60, 584; Amores II ix 31-2; II x 9-14.

(7) We are not specifically told which characteristics of the Povre Perdu make him so worthy of the princess. However, since Aymon is at pains to stress his hero's generosity (7007-94) and skill and courage in battle (6787-6804, 6813-20), one may assume that these qualities are paramount. Other qualities of which the princess has heard, or which she has been able to observe for herself, are his courteous amiability (5633-8), his tact and good breeding (6258-63), and his humility and sweetness (7357-96), as well as his generally noble bearing (5585-8) and the deep impression he makes on all who see him.

These arguments are all designed to show that there is nothing wrong, shameful or degrading about loving a man of low rank, so long as he has a noble character. Another aspect of the case against such love, Sipriaigne's exhortation to Romadanaple to love a high-born man who will bring her honour, is answered in a way which considerably widens the scope of the debate. Not only will Romadanaple find more true honour as the wife of a humble man who loves her, but she will moreover be far happier in such a marriage. The prospects for Romadanaple's future happiness are not touched on in the arguments against loving an inferior, except insofar as happiness can be assumed to come from being in a position of honour; in the case in favour, on the other hand, the question of happiness becomes a key issue.

It is Romadanaple who first introduces the new theme, pointing out that, far from honouring her, a rich king would be so proud of his own wealth and status that he would soon neglect her:

7695	Se uns rois m'avoit enamee Assez tost avroit oblīee Et ma biateit et ma noblesce; Tant panseroit a sa richesce,
7699	Laisseroit moi per son orguel.

Later, Amors takes up this argument, extending it to show the essential difference between the Povre Perdu and a proud king as husbands, and incidentally answering the charge that it is folie

to love beneath one:

9004 "Pue(1)s entendre d'un roi felon  
 Se il te prent, que jai de lui  
 Nen avrais joie sens amui;  
 Toz jors te tendroit en justisse,  
 9008 Tant panceroit a avarisce  
 Et en croistre sa richeté,  
 Jel te di bien en verité,  
 Mialz te valt joie de folie  
 9012 Que ire de sens a ta vie.  
 Se prans roi ou empereor,  
 Nen avrais amin, mai signor.  
 Et ce cestui prans a mari,  
 9016 Si avrais signor et ami;  
 Ne te tendrait pas en despit..."  
 9021 Fait amor[s]: "En cestui prendras  
 Signor et amin, se tu l'ais.  
 Grant joie en avrais a ta vie.  
 Ne dois ameir per signerie."

Here we see clearly that Romadanaple's future happiness is at stake, and that it depends upon her marrying a man who will truly love and honour her, as opposed to a man who simply gives her a status which the world regards as honourable. If she marries the king of Hungary (the roi felon of line 9004), she may have the social status of a queen, but she will be under her husband's dominion (en justisse, line 9007; Hilka glosses "Herrschaft, Gewalt, Macht") because, out of avarice, he will restrict her freedom (8). Nor is the king of Hungary the only potential husband who would lord it over Romadanaple, denying her both happiness and true honour; any man whose rank equalled or surpassed her own would

---

(8) This seems to be the meaning of lines 9006-9. However, in view of the similar wording of l.7698, quoted above, it may be that Romadanaple is again referring, elliptically, to the likelihood that a rich, mean king would neglect her.

exercise similar dominion over her, and be her lord rather than her lover (9013-4). The dual sense of signor as "overlord" and "husband" is then exploited by Aymon to emphasise the real superiority of the Povre Perdu, who will not only treat Romadanaple with the honour she deserves (9017), but will also be both lover and husband to her, ensuring her future happiness (9021-3).

This emphasis on the importance of having a husband who is both signor and amin reminds one of Chrétien's similar use of the terms amie, dame and fame in Frec (ll. 4648-51) and Cligès (ll. 6631-8). Whether Aymon borrowed the idea directly from Chrétien, or whether, as C. Luttrell has suggested, "the similar expression of sentiments in Florimont, Cligès and Yvain proves no more than a common cultural background on the subject of love" (9), need not concern us here : what is of interest is the concept itself, and the way in which it is handled by the two different writers.

At the end of Cligès, Chrétien implies that a love-match, in which the woman combines the rôles of sweetheart (amie) and wife (dame) (10), is the ideal form of marriage. Aymon, since he is

---

(9) The Creation of the First Arthurian Romance (London 1974), p.44.

(10) Although I believe that Chrétien is using dame here in its common sense of "married noblewoman", this does not exclude the other sense of dame as "lady" (domina). A. Grisay, G. Lavis and M. Dubois-Stasse show the frequency of both senses on pp. 118-122 and 124-7 of Les Dénominations de la Femme (Liège 1969).

looking at the question from the woman's point of view, expresses the same ideal as a marriage in which the husband is both signor and amin. In both cases, the marriage is ideal because it promotes lasting love and happiness (Cligès 6639-41; Florimont 9016-24). In Erec, as well as the suggestion that, in a perfect marriage, the woman is both amie and fame, we find the theme of maistrie (11): is Erec, as the lover, to be at the command of his amie (ll. 4884-90), or is he, as the husband, to be the undisputed "head of the woman"? Aymon's concept of the husband as both signor and amin is a way of resolving this conflict, for the absolute power of the lord over his wife will be tempered by the respectful service he owes her as her lover. 7

We find this theme again in an earlier passage of Florimont, where Romadanaple uses the issues of maistrie and of her own happiness in marriage as arguments to persuade her mother that she should marry a poor and humble man rather than one whose rank and wealth equal hers:

---

(11) In his article "The Romance of Erec, son of Iac" (Modern Philology XI (1913-14) pp.445-89), W.A.Nitze analysed the theme of maistrie or sovereignty in Erec, and the element of masculine pride in Erec's motivation. These ideas were further developed by A.Adler in his article "Sovereignty as the principle of unity in Chrétien's Erec", PMLA 60 (1945) pp.917-36, and have recently been used by Zara Zaddy as the basis of her convincing interpretation of Erec as a man who, after first dominating his wife, learns to respect her (Chrétien Studies, Glasgow 1973, pp.14-23 and 30-31).



- 7891 Mai en ses livres que on li(s)t (12)  
 Ai veü mainte fois escrit  
 Que amor[s] n'iert ja bien servie  
 Que d'ambe[s] pars ait signorie.  
 7895 Mai quant li uns d'ous s'umelie,  
 Li atres sert et s'asouplie;  
 Car li uns sert plus doucement  
 Quant l'autres fet le pleissement.  
 7899 De joie sont andui signor,  
 Et joie vient de lor amor  
 De halt, de baix, si com moi samble,  
 Que bone amor aient ansamble;  
 7903 Car se li doi fuissent d'un grant,  
 En la main ne vasissent tant, (13)  
 Ne les peüst on acorder  
 A seu que on vosist ovrer.  
 7907 Qui met richesce en richeté,  
 Par foi, amor[s] ne l'en seit gré.

(12) I have been unable to find which livres Aymon might have been thinking of here. Hilka points out (Florimont p.CXXX §21a) that the idea that lovers should s'asouplir is found in Eneas (1.8176), but does not give any source for the inadvisability of seignorie (which I take here to mean not only high rank, but also masterfulness) in love. The expression amer par seignurie is also found in Marie de France's Equitan, line 148, where it is glossed by Ewert as "[love] in virtue of his position as seigneur". I have not found other medieval writers who, like Aymon, advocate inequality of rank between husband and wife as the source of happiness in marriage. On the contrary, some writers, such as the author of Durmart, expressly recommend equality of rank (Durmart 860-72). Chrétien, in Erec, is at pains to stress the fundamental equality of Erec and Enide (1484-96), and certainly does not suggest that their unequal rank promotes their happiness. Marie, in the passage from Equitan referred to above (lines 116-148), asserts that the lovers should be of equal birth, and also, more importantly, have an equal share of the dominance (dangier) in the relationship. Although she is arguing against inequality of rank, her views on the harmfulness of dangier and seignurie are remarkably similar to Aymon's, as will be seen by referring to the complete passage, which is unfortunately too long to quote here. Nevertheless, I feel it would be rash to assert that Marie's lai was one of the books indicated by Aymon as the source for the ideas expressed here by Romadanaple. Hilka gives part of the Equitan passage as a co parison with Aymon's "bone amor pas nen elist" (p.CXVIII), but does not note that both use the expression "amer par seignurie".

(13) The use of main here is not glossed by Hilka, nor is this line from Florimont quoted by TL in the entry for main. Two mss. have the variant reading "En l'amer", giving the possibility of interpreting lines 7903-4 as: "If they are both of the same high rank, they are not worth that much in love". However, it seems to me likely that main here is the feminine noun derived from manere, and used in the expression en la main to mean "in the home, in the household" (TL vol.5, col.828). Thus, two lovers of equal rank, who cannot be worth the same when en ménage, can never be brought to agree on anything (lines 7905-6). Aymon is pointing out the need for "give and take" in marriage, and considers that when both partners are of high rank, neither will be prepared to do the giving, although their rank is not of the same importance in the home as outside it.

Here we see clearly that the culminating argument in favour of marrying a poor knight is that the marriage will be far happier, and more loving, than a marriage between two people of equally high birth. In an unequal marriage, the partner whose rank is lower is naturally ready to give way, and anxious to please the other. This humility and readiness to please make it easy for the nobler partner to follow the same path of loving service and docility (7895-8). Then, as a paradoxical result of their inequality, both will be equally lords of joy and love (7899-7902). A marriage between people of equally high rank, on the other hand, is not propitious for love and will lead to discord (7903-8); it is, moreover, a waste of resources (7909-18, not quoted here).

Lastly, Romadanaple's answer to the threats by the Queen and Sipriaigne that her love for the Povre Perdu will get her into trouble is, simply, that she doesn't care what her father does:

7691      Puis je donc le vouloir de moi  
               Laissier por le vouloir le roi?...  
 7714      Del damaige ne m'espoënt.

Thus the arguments in favour of loving a poor man of low birth are, briefly : that love is no respecter of persons ("Amors n'ait de paraige cure" (1071), as Romadanaple's father has already noted); that nobility of character and a bold heart (riche cuer, 5649 and 7533) are more important than nobility in a man's pedigree or riches in his coffers; and that a princess will gain more true honour, love and happiness by marrying a poor man for love than by marrying a rich king for the sake of wealth and status.

Before leaving this debate as presented in Florimont, one should note how firmly the argument on both sides rests on the assumption that love will lead to marriage. Indeed, the problem of whether or not Romadanaple should love the Povre Perdu would scarcely arise, were it not for the inevitable consequence to which it is assumed her love will lead. The opposition of the Queen and Sipriaigne clearly springs from their belief that it would be unseemly, degrading, shameful and so forth for Romadanaple to marry a pauper, rather than from objections to her simply loving him. Love alone would not have either the publicity or the permanence to give rise to such a determined attack : it is marriage, the permanent and public manifestation of love, which poses the real threat to the dignity of Romadanaple and her family. And in the other camp, one of the key arguments rests on Romadanaple's prospects of happiness as a wife, which would be an irrelevant issue were it not for the fact that the debate is, basically, a debate about marriage. Both sides, moreover, make constant reference to the contrast between the Povre Perdu and the king of Hungary -- a contrast which arises only because both of them are men Romadanaple might marry. Thus, although Aymon does not rigourously define the terms of the argument, and appears in many places to be speaking simply of love, and not of marriage, it must be understood that the concept of marriage is intimately involved with that of love, and indeed determines the form and nature of the whole debate.

The issues raised during the discussion of Romadanaple's love

for a poor hero recur in many of the other romances which use the same theme, though few if any of these other works analyse the subject as fully as does Aymon in Florimont. A topic which is very frequently found is that of the shame and degradation of loving an inferior. In the early stages of her acquaintance with the hero, many a heroine feels, as does Romadanaple herself in the same conditions, that it would be a disgrace to love a young man of lower birth than her own. In several cases, the heroine is presented as a proud young woman who has already refused offers of marriage from high-born suitors, and therefore has all the more reason to reject a low-born one. One of the haughtiest is Felice, heroine of Gui de Warewic, who will not accept any of the dukes and counts who ask for her hand, because she believes she is too well-educated, beautiful and noble for them (69-74). When Gui, the son of her father's vassal, declares his love for her, she scorns him openly :

343      Dune sui jo fille vostre seignur?  
           Mult me faites grant deshonor,  
           Quant me requerez de folie,  
           Que jo seie vostre amie;  
 347      Ne trovai home qui tant me deist,  
           Ne d'amur tant me requeist,  
           Nul duc, cunte ne barrun;  
           Se ore amasse un gargun,  
 351      Que mis hom est e estre deit,  
           Ma belté tant mal serreit;  
           Se jo ore tei amasse  
           E tanz gentils homes refusasse,  
 355      Ducx e cuntes e baruns...  
           Desparagee trop serreie.

It might appear here that Felice's indignation is caused by the fact that she thinks Gui has made an improper suggestion to her.

However, as with the comparison between the *Povre Perdu* and the king of Hungary in *Florimont*, the contrast here drawn by Felice between Gui's request and those of the "dux e cuntes e baruns" is significant : Felice evidently thinks of Gui's request, like theirs, as implying some sort of proposal of marriage, by which she would be degraded (*desparagee*).

Ydoine, too, has refused many offers, as much from a total contempt for love, lovers and men in general as from a particular pride in her own status (176-190). The feudal relationship between her and Amadas is the same as that between Felice and Gui, but her reaction to Amadas' first declaration is less cruel than that of the rather crudely-drawn heroine of the later romance. Though outraged by Amadas' presumption, Ydoine restrains herself (506-55), and tries to explain politely why his request is out of the question (14) :

531 Ne me voel pas pour toi hounir.  
 Pucele sui de haut parage:  
 Ne puis trouver en mon corage  
 Qu'en tel maniere amer te doie,  
 535 Que ja loee n'en seroie,  
 Mais blasmee de toute gent,  
 Car j'amerioie bassement;  
 Et d'autre part, en cuer ne l'ai.

---

(14) Ydoine's self-control reminds one of the lady in Andreas' second dialogue, speaking to an inferior : "Si je n'étais pas décidée à ignorer l'outrage que tu fais à mon rang, je te répondrais avec la plus grande dureté; mais, puisqu'il est peu distingué pour une femme de ma condition d'user contre quiconque d'un langage blessant et discourtois, mon âme supporte avec patience tes propos et je te réponds avec aménité." (Quoted from the translation by Claude Buridant, Paris 1974, p.62).

However, although Ydoine here expresses her rejection in terms of "what other people will say", it is clear that she herself believes she would be disgraced by loving beneath her, and later, when Amadas persists in his unwelcome attentions, she is as cruelly scornful as Felice (730-63; 1006-1035).

Another heroine who at first refuses to have anything to do with love is Clarie : she has disdained counts, kings and emperors (6731-7), and is not at all inclined to accept the suit of a young knight like Cristal, especially as she knows nothing of his status apart from his own assertion that he is a prince. Though less proud than Felice or Ydoine, she is nevertheless sensible of the shame that would be involved in loving Cristal :

7573      J'ai refusé maint roi, maint conte,  
              Se lui amasse, ce fust honte.  
              Ne sai qu'il est, fors par son dit.

She is also very conscious of the outrage that would be felt by her family in general if they knew that Cristal had asked for her love :

7551      Se j'en parole a mes amis,  
              Tost l'aroient mort et honis.  
              Ne conoissent pas son lignage  
              Ne ne sevent de son parage  
 7555      Fors ce que il nos a conté.

Clarie has already threatened Cristal to his face with revenge from her amis: one may assume that she is referring to her amis charnels, the group of responsible relatives who would normally look after the interests of a young girl, and would particularly be involved in her

marriage plans, since these would affect family property (15). The threat of intervention from Clarie's amis shows us that, in this instance as in so many others, marriage is understood to lie behind the characters' talk of love.

Melior, the heroine of Guillaume de Palerne, finds herself in a similar position to Clarie : the many suitors whom she has refused were all noble or royal, while Guillaume is a young man of unknown, and possibly base, origin. Unlike the other heroines we have mentioned, however, Melior feels attracted to Guillaume before he has fallen in love with her, and it is during her struggles against her growing love that she expresses her fears of public scorn for such a degrading connexion. Her sense of shame is also linked with another theme which we noticed in Florimont : the contrast between the shaming, humble marriage and the honour to be gained from marrying a great nobleman (16) :

1578	Bien me devroit li mons despire, Quant j'ai laissié dus et contors E rois et fix d'empereors E ceus dont je fuisse honeree
1582	Por un vallet d'autre contree, Que nus ne set, n'il ensement, De quel terre est ne de quel gent; Ainc ne conmut qui le porta,
1586	N'onques ne vit qui l'engendra.

---

(15) Mme Juliette M. Turlan has done much valuable work on the rôle of the amis charnels in medieval law. See especially pp.491-9 of her article "Recherches sur le mariage dans la pratique coutumière (XIIe-XVIe siècles)", Revue Historique de Droit Français et Etranger 35 (1957), and the ensuing article, "Amis et Amis Charnels d'après les Actes du Parlement au XIVe siècle", RHDPE 47 (1969) pp.645-698.  
 (16) See Florimont 7687-8 and pp.515-6 and 520-2 above.

The charming heroine of Jehan et Blonde differs from those we have discussed so far in that she has not received any proposals from kings or princes to contrast with the love offered by her squire. Nevertheless, she is very conscious of the difference in rank between herself and Jehan; when he declares his love, she tells him not to be so silly ("Or vous tenés miex en vo sens!", 1.890) and points out that, if he continues to serve her well, he may well be rewarded by the arrangement of a marriage to a girl of suitable rank; she herself is quite unsuitable for him, and would be deeply degraded by such a match :

891	Se de moi servir vous penés, Bien en poriés estre assenés En tel lieu dont vous venra biens. Mais or ne pensés plus pour riens
895	Que je m'amour donner vous doie; Trop durement m'abaisseroie.

Thus Blonde, too, feels that marriage to a man of lower rank would be too degrading to contemplate.

For our final example of a heroine who considers that it would be a disgrace to marry an inferior, let us take one who is so proud that she is simply known as La Fièrre — the heroine of Hue de Rotelande's Ipomedon. La Fièrre is interesting because her rejection of love is not merely a question of believing herself too high-born for her suitors; she also has an exaggerated esteem for knightly prowess, and has vowed :



- 123      Ke ja mes seigneur ne prendreit  
           Ne espuseie ne sereit,  
           Ne pur rei ne pur homme,  
           Mes ke cil fust sire de Rome  
 127      E de tuz les reines del mund  
           E de tuz les homes ke sunt,  
           Si il ne fust chivaler si pruz  
           Ke il as armes venquit tuz,  
 131      Ke en totes terres ou entrast  
           Le los et le pris en portast.

Hence, her sense of shame at the onset of her love for Ipomedon is twofold; not only is he an unknown boy of possibly low birth (994-9), but, to make matters worse, he appears to have no interest in knighthood whatsoever. La Fièvre's first thought is that the shame of marrying an inferior, for which she would indeed be "a tut dis honie" (681), can be overcome if the young man is pruz; later, since Ipomedon has done nothing to dispel his reputation as a mauvais, she fears shame from another source :

- 2481      Quant si riche vou ai voé,  
           Si avrei un vadlet amé  
           Ke unc ne fist chevalerie,  
           A tuz dis serreie hunie.

All these heroines express, in their different ways, the same idea : that it is shameful and degrading to marry a man of lower rank than theirs. However, just as Romadanaple was converted to love, and could argue that good character was more important in a lover than rank or riches, so in other romances the heroine comes to admit that the personal qualities of the hero more than compensate for his low status (17).

---

(17) As we noted in Part III above, Chap.6, p.256, this is one of the main themes of Andreas Capellanus' De Amore. As well as the passages quoted on p.256, see pp.16-17 and p.23 of the Trojel edition, where Andreas develops the idea that, as all are born of Adam and Eve, all class distinction is based on nobility of character. Further examples of the widespread medieval notion that true nobility is of the heart are given in pp.211-2 of the notes to C.Buridant's translation of the De Amore (André le Chapelain, Traité de l'Amour Courtois, Paris 1974).

Indeed, in the case of La Fièvre, the terms of her vow show that no "conversion" is needed : she starts out with the assumption that a man's virtues — in particular, his prowess and renown as a knight — are more important than his rank. In stating that she would rather marry the best knight in the world than the highest emperor, La Fièvre is, in effect, substituting knightly renown for high birth in her scale of values. Moreover, since her insistence on renown is itself treated by Hue as a sure sign of her excessive pride, we may assume that it is not only in La Fièvre's scale of values that such a substitution is possible. Hue himself must have thought that great prowess was the equivalent of great nobility, and must have expected his audience to think so too, and to agree with him that La Fièvre was being extremely proud when she set her sights on the best knight in the world, rather than on the emperor of Rome.

Thus for La Fièvre, the problem is not that she has to learn that personal qualities are more important than social status; rather, she has to learn that knightly prowess is not the only virtue which may make an apparently poor man deserve the love of a noble lady. In this, however, she is hampered by the publicity of her vow to marry the bravest knight in the world. Although she privately admits that Ipomedon's beauty and courtesy are enough to make <sup>him</sup> worthy of her love (lines 1000ff), she cannot publicly forswear herself by marrying a mere boy who shows no prowess. It is this horror of breaking her vow — Hue tells us that she would rather die than break it (688) — which ultimately determines her

to choose as a husband the victor of a tournament, and to reject Ipomedon unless, by attending the tournament, he proves his valour (lines 2485-2510).

In making this decision, La Fièvre reiterates her original belief that rank and titles are of little account compared with knightly renown; she will marry the victor of the tournament

2553      Ki ke il seit, de quel parage.

However, she is prevented by her proud vow from going further and marrying a man who has neither rank nor prowess, even though she has now learnt that great beauty and courtoisie are as deserving of love as is great prowess.

La Fièvre, then, is already convinced before she meets Ipomedon that her future husband's rank is not his most important quality. The other heroines we have mentioned make this discovery only after they have met the man concerned, and, in many cases, after they have initially rejected him as being too low-born. It is Ydoine who expresses most clearly her new belief that a man's personal qualities can more than make up for his lack of rank. Noticing Amadas' beauty, and impressed, in spite of herself, by the fact that he is literally dying of love for her, she experiences a change of heart (1058-1115). She now sees that his bianté and biens make him worthy of the most noble princess on earth :

1125      Seulement pour la grant biauté  
             Dont Dix l'a si enluminé,  
             Et pour les biens qui en lui sont  
             Plus qu'en tous les homes du mont,  
 1129      N'a sous ciel si haute mescine,  
             Fille de roi ne de roïne,  
             S'il la daignast amer d'amour,  
             N'eüst de lui mult grant hounour.

Similarly, Clarie, at the end of her long mental debate over whether to love Cristal or not, draws up a list of his manifold virtues and decides that he deserves to be her ami and to win her kingdom (8118-28).

The idea that personal qualities compensate for low birth is not specifically expressed by the heroine of Gui de Warewic, although her handmaid remarks that the strength of Gui's love makes him worthy of an emperor's daughter (576-82). Later, however, when Gui has won world-wide renown at her behest, the tables are turned on Felice. She tells her father she would like to marry Gui, pointing out that "El mund n'en ad, ço quit, sun per" (7472). Her father agrees that their family would be honoured by a connexion with Gui (7478), but warns Felice that she may not be good enough for him; he has refused many princesses

7484      Qui mult erent de greignur valurs  
             Que n'estes vus ne ja mes serrez.

Thus the romance provides a practical demonstration of the idea that the possession of surpassing knightly renown may make a young man the superior both of his own overlord and of his lord's proud daughter.

In Jehan et Blonde, as in Gui de Warewic, the heroine's "conversion" to love is not accompanied by a specific declaration that personal worth is more important than rank. Instead, Blonde rails against her own wealth and status, which made her despise Jehan (1080-87), and reflects that, although less well-born than she, he is nevertheless a handsome and noble man (1115-7); indeed, he is

1131                   li plus biaux  
                   li plus legiers, li plus isniaus,  
                   li mix servans et li plus sages  
                   Qui ainc issist de nos lingnages.

This may, I believe, be taken to imply that Jehan has such good qualities that he is worthy of Blonde's love.

In Guillaume de Palerne, the concept that personal merit is more important, from the point of view of love, than rank or wealth, is expressed in terms very similar to those used in Florimont. As in the earlier romance, we find an explicit statement that love is not a question of rank, and an association between riches and avarice, seen in the passage quoted below (cp. Florimont 1.7540, quoted on p. 518 above, and ll.9004 ff, quoted on p. 521). Another similarity is that love is personified. In Guillaume de Palerne, Amors dispels Melior's doubts about Guillaume's parentage with the words :

1590           Je ne vois pas par signorie,  
                   Par parage ne par hautece,  
                   Mes la ou mes voloirs s'adrece;...  
 1595           S'aim mix les larges et les frans,  
                   Les prex, les sages, les vaillans,  
                   Les bien apris et les cortois  
                   Que tos ces princes et ces rois  
 1599           Ne ces contes avers mauvais.

Curiously, none of the other romances in which I have examined the question of the heroine's loving an apparent inferior contains this type of explicit statement that love is no respecter of persons.

The idea that personal qualities are more important than riches and status occurs in other romances besides those in which the heroine is at first ashamed of her humble lover. The author of Partonopeus, in particular, stresses this argument in favour of the marriage of his heroine to the relatively poor Partonopeus. At their first meeting, Melior tells Partonopeus that she is the fabulously rich empress of Byzantium, and that her vassals have urged her to marry (1334-48). Their criteria for selecting a suitable husband rest on the assumption that good character and great wealth can be balanced against each other; since Melior has the riches on her side, she should look for personal qualities in her future husband, rather than extensive fiefs (1349-53). Later, during the argument over whether Melior should marry Partonopeus or the sultan of Persia, the same idea recurs:

10257      Que chalt de fiuz ne de richece  
              Quant li François a plus prouece?  
              S'il a ma dame, assés avra,  
              Et s'il daigne, plus aquerra,  
              Car assez set et assés valt.

Here we see, more clearly than in the other examples we have mentioned, that there is a certain practical basis to the belief

that good qualities in a knight can compensate for his lack of lands and wealth. Partonopeus' skill and courage in battle will amply make up for his lack of fiefs, for they will enable him to conquer other fiefs if ever he wishes to, as well as — by implication — to defend those he wins in marrying Melior.

Nor is this limited practical justification the only contribution made by the author of Partonopeus to the debate over the relative importance of rank and merit in a husband. In assessing the seven candidates for Melior's hand, Anfors makes an interesting analysis of the right of a vavassor to marry above his station. Speaking of the vavassor Gaudin, he says:

9943	Molt est bien nez, n'ient de rois, Ains est de vavassors cortois; Molt sunt prodome vavassor, Et molt vivent a grant honor,
9947	Si sunt, ce m'est avis, la gent De quoi vient plus d'affaitement, De chiens, d'oisials et de servise Et de desduit de tote guise,
9951	De dras, de boivre et de mangier, Et cil sunt si bon chevalier Et sunt de si noble parage Que nule dame en mal aage
9955	Nel doit por bas lin renfuser S'ele por el le vuet amer.

Clearly, Anfors considers that nobility is as much a question of education and personal excellence as it is of birth, and the vavassor, whose class is the very well-spring of the courtly

life-style, has as good a claim to a princess' hand as has any king (18).

It is in Ille et Galeron, however, that we find the most explicit statement of the theory that, in a future husband, personal qualities are more important than wealth or rank. Gautier d'Arras puts these views into the mouth of his second heroine, Ganor, daughter of the emperor of Rome, after she has been jilted by Ille. The hero tries, rather clumsily, to comfort her by pointing out that he was not worthy of her anyway, since he is only the son of a knight, Eliduc. This provokes a passionate tirade from Ganor, in which she makes it absolutely clear that, for her, Ille's comparatively low birth and poverty are irrelevant, since it is his outstanding personal merit which makes him worthy of her :

---

(18) This flattering portrait of the vavassor differs from the stereotype of the bon vavasseur more usually encountered in romances, as described by B.Woledge in his article "Bons Vavasseurs et Mauvais Sénéchaux", Mélanges Lejeune (Gembloux 1969), pp.1263-77. As Woledge points out, the vavassor of romance is generally an older man leading a sedentary life, having passed the age for fighting: "ce sont des personnages courtois qui ne se battent pas et qui cependant ne sont pas des clercs." (p.1272). They may, however, go hunting, as here (art.cit. p.1266). Anfors here describes vavassors who are fighters (bon chevalier) and also young enough to be interested in clothes and desduit. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that the specific example of a vavassor who provokes these generalisations, Partonopeus' companion Gaudin, is himself very true to the pattern described by Woledge; although an excellent fighter, he is middle-aged (over fifty, 1.9926), poor (7860), and hospitable (7865-9).



- 3782 ..."Por Deu, le roi celestre,  
Que monte a moi de vostre ancestre?  
Je ne voi gaires home amer  
Por ce c'on l'ot roial clamer,  
3786 N'est nus qui vive comme rois  
Ne valle toi; soiés cortois  
Et vostre pere soit vilains,  
Ja por ice ne valrés mains.  
3790 A cascun en son cuer demeure  
Por c'on l'aville o on l'oneure;  
Ne li vient mie de plus loing,  
On ne li quiert altre tesmoing.  
3794 Oïstes me vos ainc requerre,  
Se vostre pere ot rice terre  
U s'il ert besogneus d'avoir?  
Miels aim jo vostre pere avoir  
3798 U vos amer por vostre pere?  
Miels ameroie, biax dols frere,  
Por vos tot seul les plus estous  
Que vos tot seul por aus trestous,  
3802 S'il erent neïs rei o conte.  
De vostre pere a moi que monte  
Li sospir qui del cuer me vienent  
Et qui si priés del cuer me tienent?  
3806 Onques de lui ne me sovint  
Quant ceste volentés me vint  
De vos amer, de vos joïr.  
Il ne me tient nul jor d'oïr  
3810 De vostre pere nule rien.  
Asés a en cascade bien  
Por c'on le doit amer por lui  
U haïr plus que por altrui.  
3814 Onques quant j'acointai vostre estre  
Ne me sovint de vostre ancestre.  
Par icel Deu qui maint sor nos  
Amet vos ai trestot por vos,  
3818 Non por autrui, ce sace Dex,  
Mais por ce que vos estes tex  
Con tos li mons set et entent. (19)

We have quoted this passage at length, since it makes so abundantly clear the attitude to rank which Ganor shares with the other heroines who love beneath them. Indeed, Ganor goes further

---

(19) This passage appears in both manuscripts of Ille. I have quoted from the Wollaton ms., since its readings seem to me on the whole preferable; however, in l. 3811, the reading of the Paris ms., which has rien for bien, clarifies the important statement of ll. 3811-3. (Ms. P avoids rhyming rien with rien in ll. 3810-1; the reading at the end of l. 3810 is ne du mien.)

than many of her sisters, since she is prepared to admit that even the son of a vilain should be judged on his own personal merit, and not on his father's status (20). In general, however, Ganor does no more than voice the opinion of the other heroines we are considering here. All of these girls, sooner or later, come to believe, like Ganor, that :

3790      A cascun en son cuer demeure  
             Por c'en l'aville e on l'oneure...  
 3811      Asés a en cascade rien  
             Por c'en le doit amer por lui,  
             U haïr, plus que por altrui.

(My punctuation: reading amended according to Ms. P).

As for the question of precisely which virtues enable a man to overcome the matrimonial handicap of relatively low birth, we have already noticed that knightly prowess seems to be among the most important. It is prized particularly highly by La Fièvre, and by the heroine of Gui de Warewic, who will only agree to marry Gui if he becomes the best knight in the world (1071-79). Other heroines, however, see skill in battle as just one among many qualities which redeem their lover's lower status. Ydoine, having accepted Amadas' love, sends him off at once to win renown as a knight, but also stipulates that he must practise many other virtues in order to deserve her love (1224-6). The fact that Guillaume de Palerne is preux is only one of the virtues which

---

(20) I take the word vilains in l. 3788 to refer to social position as well as to moral characteristics. This interpretation fits into the general framework of Ganor's argument, which opposes moral worth to social status rather than to moral turpitude.

make him worthy of Melior's love (1045, 1596), and Ganor, who is attracted to Ille partly because of his proÿce, is also influenced by his other qualities (SATF 2398 ff., Foerster ed. 3211 ff.) (21).

Prowess and skill in battle are, of course, qualities which impress a heroine's male relatives or other guardians, and may make them look more favourably on a poor or low-born suitor. For example, Clarie's father thinks that Cristal would be an acceptable son-in-law because, as well as knowing how to rule a kingdom, he is a good knight, proux et vaillans, and good at leading an army (8425-52). Galeron considers that her brother ought to agree to her marrying Ille, because of the latter's prowess in his service (P.1399-1402). In this she is proved right: it is indeed Ille's prowess, and the possibility of ensuring his protection in future, which determine Conain to marry Ille to his sister (P.1408-23; W.870-875). Melior believes that her marriage to Partonopeus will be acceptable to her vassals once he has become a chevaliers eslis (1489-1501), and, as we have seen, Partonopeus' proÿce does, in the end, weigh heavily in his favour when the vassals come to make their choice (10257-11, quoted above). Indeed, one might say that, among the heroines who love men of lower rank than themselves, only La Fièvre and Felice de Warewic are especially influenced by the hero's prowess and fame as knight; the others regard prowess as just one among many desirable qualities, or

---

(21) The other qualities required of the successful suitor will be discussed below, after the present discussion of prowess.

attach importance to it partly because it is likely to impress the father, brother or vassals who will have the final say in their choice of husband (22).

In Florimont, we noticed that, apart from prowess in battle, the qualities by which the Pevre Perdu impresses Romadanaple are probably his generosity, his affability, his savoir-faire, his humility towards herself, his openness and sweetness, his generally noble bearing and good looks, the fact that everyone praises him, and his riche cuer. We find that many of these characteristics — most of which could be summed up under the category of courtoisie — are mentioned in other works where the hero's qualities make up for his apparently inferior rank. Melior loves Guillaume de Palerne because he is larges, debonaire, courtois, adrois and frans (1044-6); later, Amors adds two more qualities, pointing out that those who, like Guillaume, are sages and bien apris, are more deserving of love than the rich and high-born (1595-9). Moreover, Melior, like Romadanaple, is impressed by the golden opinions which her beloved earns from all her father's people (818-23, 1047). Ydoine, as we have seen, is finally won over by Amadas' biautés and biens; presumably these biens are the good qualities the author has earlier described (Amadas is sages, humles, amiavles, frans, courtois, serviçavles, and de tous deduis, de chiens, d'oisiaus...apris, 65-72).

---

(22) Similarly, Laudine uses Yvain's grant vasselage as an argument to persuade her vassals that she ought to marry him, and provide a defender for the magic fountain (Yvain, lines 2040 ff).

Ydoine herself also encourages Amadas to practise a similar group of good qualities (1227-37, 1251-2), which again are probably the kind of biens which inspire her to love him in the first place. Similarly, Melior only refers in general to Partonopeus' bontés and bones mors when explaining why she loves him (1369-72), but we may assume that these good qualities are those the author has earlier attributed to his hero :

545      Molt ert et pros et ceragos  
             Et dols et humles et hontos,  
             Larges et frans et envoisiés.

Some heroines also seem to count among their lovers' virtues the fact that, although less noble than themselves, they are nevertheless gentil. Ydoine (Amadas 1123), Blonde (1115) and Melior of Byzantium (Partonopeus 1371) all refer to this quality, and, in the first two cases, it seems that these heroines are concerned simply with social status, and not with any moral overtones of gentillece. Melior, however, takes the concept further : Partonopeus is not only of such noble ancestry that he is bound to be acceptable to her vassals (1505-6), but moreover his noble blood will ensure that his conduct, too, is noble (1507-14). As we shall see, this strong connexion between noble birth and noble behaviour reappears in the thinking of some other heroines — those who, like Romadanaple, do not know what their lover's social origins are.

Another quality, to which we have already drawn attention in the case of the Povre Perdu, is that of riche cuer. This is a

virtue which also furthers the cause of one or two other heroes,  
notably Ille, of whom Galeron declares :

3200        Quex hom sos ciel que fust ses pere,  
             Si valt il miols c'uns emperere.  
             A lui pert molt bien qui il est :  
             De riche cuer riche conquest,  
3204        Riche parole et riche fait.

(Quoted from the SATF ed.  
Foerster ed. 4083-7).

The same boldness of heart — here called grant cuer — impresses  
Orguellose d'Amor when she meets it in Blancandin (1075-6), and  
it may also be relevant that Clarie thinks more kindly of Cristal  
because he is enprenans and hardis (7558-63, quoted below, p. 555).

Thus, apart from courage and skill in battle, the qualities  
which a young man needs in order to overcome the handicap of inferior  
birth are those generally associated with courtoisie, such as  
generosity (23), helpfulness, gentleness, humility, openness, good  
manners, skill in sports and games, and light-hearted gaiety. It  
is also important that he should not be base-born; a certain degree  
of gentillece is expected even by heroines who, like Melior of  
Byzantium, deliberately set out to marry a relatively poor man (24).

---

(23) Obviously generosity is not an easy virtue for a poor knight  
to practice. Aymon de Varennes includes a lengthy homily on this  
very point in Florimont (lines 4174-4358), where the hero's tutor  
explains that true generosity is supported by prowess, which brings  
in the means wherewith to dispense largesse.

(24) For comments on the one heroine who does marry the son of a  
villain, see below, p. 567.

One may, however, feel that these qualities would be advantageous to any young man, and that the assets most likely to be of particular benefit to the humble suitor of a high-born lady are a bold heart, without which he will scarcely dare to approach her, and the widespread praise of his fellows, which will give him the social prestige he otherwise lacks. This last asset, of course, brings us back to the virtue of skill in battle with which we started, for it is precisely by winning praise and renown (los et pris) in battle that a young knight rises in social status, as the example of Gui de Warewic clearly indicates.

In this connexion, it is interesting to note that several of our romances contain episodes in which a knight's courage and fighting skill win him a wife in the most literal sense, for a bride is offered as a prize in a tournament. Wife-winning tournaments are found in Le Bel Inconnu, Partonopeus, Ipomedon, Durmart, Fergus and Escanor, although in Durmart it is not the heroine who is the prize, but some ladies who have themselves chosen this method of finding husbands. One may wonder, however, whether a contest to choose the best fighter is, in fact, a good method of choosing a husband, who of course needs other qualities, as we have seen. It is therefore worth considering how appropriate a tournament is for the purpose of finding a husband. The tournament in Partonopeus, in which the selection of the victor is most carefully argued, is a particularly good example on which to base our investigation.

An important consideration to bear in mind is that the winner of this tournament will not simply become Melier's husband, but will also be the emperor of her lands. The tournament, therefore, is also a method of choosing a future ruler, and it may well appear better adapted to this function than to that of choosing a husband. Military prowess is clearly an essential qualification for the man who will have to defend his lands against aggressors, and who may also aspire to increase his domains by conquest abroad. In the deliberations of the judges in Partonopeus, particular emphasis is laid on this point, and the military skill and leadership of the different candidates is carefully assessed (10165-10262).

However, Melier too sets store by the prowess and courage of the man she loves. She is particularly susceptible to the fact that Partonopeus combines these qualities with gentleness and with humility towards her, his lady :

8625	Dex! Tant il est hardis et fiers Et tant il est bons chevaliers; Et od ce qu'il est molt estolz, Cum il par est humles et doz!
8629	Dex! Com se joignent en li bel Cuers de lion et cuer[s] d'oise! (var: d'aiguel).

This admiring exclamation is called forth by a particularly daring feat, in which Partonopeus risks his life to kneel before Melior in the middle of the fighting, and the incident shows how suitable is a tournament, at which ladies can be spectators, for a heroine to judge and be impressed by a potential husband's bravery and skill in arms.



Nor are these the only qualities which can be assessed in a tournament. Partonopeus and his companion Gaudin, for instance, display their loyalty by undertaking any risk to rescue each other from dangerous situations. Wisdom is shown in deciding when, how and whom to attack; restraint in refusing to be provoked into foolhardiness, or in conserving one's strength and not exhausting oneself on the first day. Nobility of character can be seen in acts of mercy or chivalry, as when Partonopeus remounts his enemy the sultan. And, since a tourney was not conducted in silence, a participant might well have the opportunity of showing that he was good-humoured, and also that he kept his promises and did not speak rashly. Elegance of dress and equipment, such as Partonopeus' shining white armour, could also be displayed; and, most importantly, a tournament would be an excellent place to demonstrate one's generosity. Any great lord taking part would have ample opportunity to show his open-handedness with his followers, and to entertain lavishly in the evenings; and even an individual knight such as Partonopeus could be noted for his generosity to a friend or to defeated enemies, and for liberality in the bestowing of captured horses. Thus the qualities of loiauté, sagesse, mesure, franchise, envoiesüre, bel parler, cointise and largesse can all be demonstrated during a tournament. Many of these are qualities which Melior might well look for in a husband, as well as being the virtues of a good ruler, as indicated by Ernol in Partonopeus (lines 6567-72).

However, the one quality which, more than any other, enables a poor young hero to conquer the heart of a rich heroine, can scarcely be described as a virtue. This pre-eminent asset is that of physical beauty. Unlike the other attributes we have mentioned, handsomeness is a characteristic which influences nearly all the heroines who love beneath them; indeed, the only one who does not specifically mention it is Romadanaple. We have seen that, for Ydoine, the two qualities which make Amadas worthy of the noblest girl in the world are his biens and biauté (1125-32, quoted above, p. 534). Ganor falls in love with Ille for his good looks as well as his good qualities (W 2398 ff, 3211 ff), and her love grows in contemplating his physical beauty (W 2482 ff, P 3315 ff). La Fièvre's love for Ipomedon, too, is kindled by his beauty (725-30). In L'Escoufle, Aelis' reverie on the night after Guillaume has been banished from her presence shows that it is his beauty, more than any other of his attributes, which occupies her thoughts, and which indeed makes her decide that Guillaume deserves to marry her (3222-49). Their lovers' good looks are also considered by Blonde (1115), Clarie (8067-73) and Melior of Rome (820, 850-51, 920-5) to be as important as their moral qualities in entitling them to the love of such well-born maidens. Most striking of all is the case of Partonopeus. Having originally won the heart of Melior of Byzantium by — among other qualities — his great biauté (1369-72, 1497-1504), he finally earns the right to marry her as the result of a beauty contest. This competition is

suggested by Melier herself, as a way of breaking the deadlock between the two finalists in the tournament, for she knows that Partonopeus cannot fail to outshine his rival, the sultan, in good looks. However, she has to resort to a certain amount of tongue-in-cheek argument to gain her vassals' consent to such a novel way of choosing their future overlord, and, in so doing, she gives us a half-serious justification of the importance attached by herself and so many other heroines to good looks in the men they marry. She starts by pointing out that marriage is for life, and that a woman must choose her partner carefully, taking both his moral and physical qualities into consideration:

10313 Mais saignor prendre est chose estable,  
 A tos tens est chose durable;  
 Si doit dame molt esgarder  
 A cui el se doit si donner.  
 10317 Assez a li François bonté,  
 Mais ne l'ai veü desarmé.  
 S'il est assés belz, je l'otroi  
 Que j'aie lui et qu'il ait moi.

Here, Melior's ploy is to suggest that her insistence on a handsome husband is dictated by her respect for the indissolubility of marriage. It is precisely because she is aware that marriage "is not by any to be enterprised, nor taken in hand, unadvisedly, lightly or wantonly", that she must give due consideration to the physical attractiveness of her future husband. Later, she uses another tactic, and charmingly turns the tables on these male chauvinists, her vassals, with a piece of twelfth-century "women's liberation" :

- 10389 Molt vuel que cil soit belz et gens  
 Qui de moi fera ses talens  
 Et qui m'avra tote ma vie,  
 Si ne vos en merveillies mie,  
 10393 Car si choisist chascuns de vos  
 Quant doit prendre une de nos. (25)

Melior here lays particular stress on the role of biauté in generating sexual attraction. The same idea can be found, rather less explicitly, in the soliloquy of Aelis to which we have already referred, and in the thoughts of Blonde (2291-2301) and Clarie (8067-8112). The ideas expressed by these heroines can be compared with the definition of love given by Andreas Capellanus : "Amor est passio quaedam innata procedens ex visione et immoderata cogitatione formae alterius sexus, ob quam aliquis super omnia cupit alterius petiri amplexibus et omnia de utriusque voluntate in ipsius amplexu amoris praecepta compleri." (26). Moreover, as Claude Buridant has reminded us, the view that love is engendered

---

(25) It is interesting to set Melior's remark against the background of the contemporary Church view of the equality of sexual rights between men and women in marriage. Since marriage was a remedy for lust in both sexes, both husband and wife had the right to insist on the fulfilment of the marriage debt by their partner. Whether or not the author of Partonopeus was aware of current Church doctrine, his heroine seems almost to be echoing it. P. Jonin gives details on the concept of the debitum conjugale at this period in Les Personnages Féminins (Aix-en-Provence 1958), pp.393-6.

(26) De Amore, ed. Trojel, p.3. Translated by C.Buridant as : "L'amour est une passion naturelle qui naît de la vue de la beauté de l'autre sexe et de la pensée obsédante de cette beauté. On en vient à souhaiter par-dessus tout de posséder les étreintes de l'autre et à désirer que, dans ces étreintes, soient respectés, par une commune volonté, tous les commandements de l'amour." (André le Chapelain, Traité de l'Amour Courtois, p.47).

by the contemplation of physical beauty was also stressed in other writings of the period, and by Ovid (27). Thus it is hardly surprising that so many authors show us their heroines being strongly influenced by the hero's good looks when they fall in love with him in spite of his relative poverty and lower rank; indeed, we would probably be justified in thinking that references to the heroine's appreciation of the hero's good looks are usually intended to suggest that she is physically attracted to him, in the way described by Andreas, even where this is not made explicit in the text of the romance.

The heroines of our romances, however, unlike Andreas' ladies, associate love with marriage, and therefore conclude that a young man's good looks entitled him not only to love, but also to a promise of matrimony.

In the context of Andreas' comments on the rôle of beauty in generating love, it is worth noting that our heroines are not like the simplex amans, the incautos vel minus sapientes amantes who, according to Andreas, make the mistake of loving for beauty's sake alone, without taking other qualities into account (28). Seen against the background of Andreas' strictures on such lovers, the fact that our heroines tend to speak in the same breath of biautés and biens gains in significance. We can see that a heroine's concern to give equal weight to physical and moral qualities is

---

(27) Ibid., note 1, pp.207-8.

(28) De Amore, ed.cit., pp.14-15.

part of the general perfection which makes her a heroine. She is not the ingénue whom Andreas criticizes, but a sapiens mulier (p.15) who will choose her lover wisely, looking for moral virtues as well as for physical beauty.

Indeed, Melior is the only heroine who appears to over-emphasise good looks at the expense of other qualities, and, as we have seen, this is simply a ploy to trick her vassals into agreeing to the beauty contest. In truth, she is as much attracted by Partonopeus' bones mors as by his biautés (1367-72).

We thus see that a heroine may be influenced by many of a young man's virtues when choosing to love him in spite of his relatively low status. In particular, nearly all the heroines we have studied are influenced by the good looks of the young man concerned. The heroine often takes the view, so clearly expressed by Ganor, that personal qualities are in any case more desirable and important than material benefits. In some romances, however, this point of view is not explicitly set out, and one feels that the hero's good looks and good character are presented from the heroine's point of view as a compensation for the rank and riches which she would have wished for in another man. This is particularly the case in some of the romances where the heroine is at first very proud, such as Gui de Warewic, Amadas and Ipomedon.

There is also another way in which heroines are influenced by the good looks and good character of their peer young lovers.

In cases where the young man's parentage is unknown, the heroine may well conclude, not simply that his good qualities compensate for his inferior birth, but that they actually prove him to be most nobly born.

We have already remarked that Melier, in praising Partenopeus' gentillece, assumes there is a causal connexion between noble birth and noble behaviour. Many other heroines make the same assumption, but reverse the direction of the causal link, saying, in effect: "if a man behaves nobly, he must be of noble blood". Exactly the same argument is used of physical beauty: "if he looks handsome and noble, he must be nobly born". These arguments are used by heroines to justify their love for young men whose origins are unknown, and who might, therefore, be mere commoners.

La Fièvre, for example, in a passage to which we have already referred, concludes that Ipomedon's beauty and courtesy must guarantee that he is of royal blood:

994	Amar, trop vas ai aqueinté, Kant my cuers est d'amer si prest Un homme qe ne sei qu'il est, De quel terre ne quel lignage,
998	C'il est de haut ou bas parage, Ne sai coment il ad a non. Qe ai jee dit! A grant reison Doit il par amour estre amez,
1002	Kar si beaus hom ne fust unc nez; Si curteis hom, mien escient, Ne nasquit unc de base gent Ne fut onc engendré, se crei,
1006	D'autre homme qe de riche rei.

In Guillaume de Palerne, it is Amor who argues that Guillaume's looks and deeds demonstrate his noble birth :

1609      Bien pues veoir a sa samblance,  
              Si com de lui fait demoustrance  
              Par ses oeuvres et par ses fais,  
              Qu'il est de haute gent estrais.

As for Cristal, it is his bold heart which convinces Clarie he must be noble:

7557      Mais je quit bien en mon corage,  
              S'engendrés fust de bas parage,  
              Que il ne püst a nul fuer  
              Dedans son cors avoir tel cuer,  
 7561      Qu'il est de petite estature.  
              Bien croi qu'il li vient de nature,  
              Qu'il est enprenans et hardis;  
              De tote riens pert bien gentis.

Line 7564 reminds us that, though he is de petite estature, Cristal's physical appearance is in other respects an indication of noble origins, for he is very handsome (8067-11). Boldness, too, is used by L'Orgueilleuse d'Amors to "prove" her lover's nobility (1071-8).

It is interesting to note that arguments of this type are not used in Florimont, although they would apply perfectly to Florimont's position as the Povre Perdu. Instead, Romadanaple accepts that the Povre Perdu is indeed poor and de petit paraige (7530-36). In the light of this acceptance, one can see that the heroines who argue from their lover's noble looks and deeds to his nobility of birth are, in a sense, evading the issue. In



"proving" that the unknown young man is really noble, they seem to convince themselves that they will not be desparagées by such a marriage. *La Fièvre* and *l'Orgueilleuse*, indeed, conclude that the young men they love are actually of higher rank than themselves, for they imagine that *Ipomedon* and *Blancandin* must be the sons of kings. *Romadanaple*, on the other hand, believes that she would indeed be desparagée by a union with the *Pevre Perdu*, and she therefore has to argue all the more closely in favour of marrying for love rather than for money and status. One cannot, however, expect to find similarly detailed arguments in other romances where the heroine is sure that the hero's status is much lower than her own. In *L'Escoufle*, for example, *Aelis* knows that *Guillaume* is only the son of a count, but this romance does not give an extensive justification of the heroine's decision to marry beneath her.

An "inferior" hero's good looks and good qualities, then, are not only attractive to the heroine in themselves : they may also help to convince her that the apparent inferior is really as noble as she. This conviction protects the heroine to some extent from the rigours of choosing between nobility of birth and nobility of character, though of course she has still to consider that such a marriage will desparagier her in other people's eyes, if not in her own.

In this connexion, it is interesting to note that few heroines echo *Romadanaple*'s contention that there is more honour to be

gained from marrying a loving husband than a rich one. Indeed, L'Escoufle is the only work in which I have found a remark which parallels this belief of Romadanaple's. During the debate between love and reason which rages in the mind of Aelis on the night of her elopement, one of Amors' arguments is:

3922        Certes, plus d'onor et de pris  
              Ara ele del fil le conte,  
              Se le prent, que de quanque monte  
              A ceste honor m'a cest empire.

There is, however, no attempt to analyse or justify this view. We are not told the reasons why Aelis will have more onor and pris from marrying Guillaume than from inheriting the Empire. One may assume that it is the excellence of Guillaume's character which will reflect glory upon his wife; or perhaps, as in Florimont, we are meant to understand that a husband who is also a lever will do his wife honour in treating her as his lady.

In our attempt to discover how far the arguments used by Romadanaple are followed by other heroines in her position, we have not so far discussed the question of the heroine's prospects of happiness in marriage. We noticed that one of Romadanaple's key arguments was based on this very point; she maintained that she would be far happier married to a poor man with whom she was in love, than as the wife of a man who did not particularly care for her, no matter how rich he was. This belief is echoed by other heroines, who stress the importance of love over riches in marriage, and declare that they would rather live in comparative

poverty with the man they love, than enjoy great riches without him.

One of the most ringing of these declarations is made by Blonde, on learning of the father's plan to marry her to the count of Gloucester. The news of her marriage, she knows, will be death to Jehan; however rich they count may be, is that any reason for her to marry him, and cause the death of her loial ami (2264-76)? Blonde answers her own question with an emphatic negative :

2277 Certes nenil! car nus tresors  
N'est si bons comme de bon cers,  
N'il ne puet estre millieur vie  
Que cele d'ami et d'amie.  
2281 Mavès gaain donques fereie,  
Se plus bel et millor perdoie  
Et loial amour pour richece.

Having thus proved that love is "worth" far more than riches in a marriage, Blonde goes on to compare Jehan's looks with those of the count, much to the latter's disadvantage (2289-94). This emphasis on Jehan's good looks suggests that Blonde is thinking particularly of the physical aspect of love — a suggestion which is confirmed a few lines later. Reflecting that Jehan is sages, courtois and gentier, as well as handsome (2295-6), Blonde is inspired to make a defiant assertion of the supremacy of love over money and lands :

2297 Miex vaut sa parole franchoise  
Que de Clocestre la ricoise,  
Miex vaut la joie et li soulas  
De lui tenir entre ses bras  
2301 Que la grant conté de Clocestre;  
Tant sai de lui et de son estre.  
Milleur de li ne puis avoir.  
Fi de richece! fi d'avoir!  
2305 Miex valent d'amours deus baisiers  
Que plaine bourse de deniers.

This fine declaration of principle is followed by the immediate reappearance of Blonde's practical good sense; she is not, after all, going to fling herself into abject poverty for Jehan's sake, since they will be able to live quite adequately on his father's estate :

2307      Assés avrons pour nostre vivre.

However, the fact that Blonde has her feet on the ground does not change the essence of the beliefs she has just affirmed : that a good man is worth more than any treasure (2277-8), that no way of life can be better than that of two lovers (2279-80), that the delights of love are more precious than lands and riches (2299-2306), and that to exchange the true love of a good and handsome man for mere wealth would be a thoroughly bad bargain (2281-3). Thus Blonde tells us unequivocally that, for her, love and happiness in marriage are of infinitely greater importance than rank and riches.

Another heroine who explicitly contrasts the benefits of marrying for love with those of making a "good" marriage is Clarie. In a dialogue with herself, she reflects on the long time which must ensue before she can obtain her father's permission for any marriage, let alone a marriage to the young unknown, Cristal (8075-80). She then tries to convince herself that a marriage to a suitably noble man, which her father will arrange, is worth waiting for (29):

---

(29) As H. Breuer, the editor of Cristal et Clarie, points out (p. LIW), large sections of this monologue of Clarie's are "borrowed" from the lay of Narcissus, including much of the passages quoted here. Further evidence of the wholesale plagiarism practised by the author of Cristal can be found on pp. I-LIX of Breuer's edition.

8095 Fille es de roïne et de roi,  
 Segnor te donra endroit toi,  
 Alques t'estaet por ce soffrir.

Immediately, her personal preference reasserts itself. What is the use of being married to a king, if he does not attract her?

8098 Et se il n'est a ton plaisir,  
 Qu'en feras tu, s'il ne te plaist?

This thought seems to have come almost unbidden into Clarie's mind, and she tries to chase away such an undutiful and carnal idea:

8100 Quant ce od dit, si se retaist;  
 Dedens son cuer se tint per fole,  
 Quant onques ot dit tel parole.  
 "Qu'est ce, Clari(e)? N'as tu dont honte?  
 8104 Ses tu donques que blasmes monte?  
 Et te plaist il avoir Cristal?"

The attempt, however, is unsuccessful. Her feeling for Cristal triumphs; she decides that she is, after all, in love with him, and that his love is worth more than any marriage to a king :

8112 Ses amors valent mieus de roi.

Thus Clarie rejects the status of a royal marriage in favour of a love-match, and in so doing she is thinking of her own future happiness. If she marries a king for the sake of his noble rank, she may well find that her private life is unhappy, since the king's status is no guarantee that he will be personally attractive to her. On the other hand, she loves Cristal, although he is only a poor young stranger. So, for the sake of love, she chooses to marry the soldoier rather than the king.

Aelis, too, attaches great importance to love. Her situation is similar to Blonde's, in that she must defy family pressure and social convention in order to marry for love, and in so doing will sacrifice considerable wealth — in Aelis' case, her own inheritance of the Empire of Rome. Although this sacrifice does not seem to concern Aelis much, she too, like Blonde, sees the exchange of love for money as a bad bargain:

3232      Je n'en penroie pas mil livres  
              De besans, qui les me donroit,  
              Por autre prendre. En'ai je droit  
              Quant cist me plaist? S'est biax et sages,  
 3236      S'avons esté tos nos eages  
              Norri ensemble et jor et nuit.

Here we see that, for Aelis, the fact that she loves Guillaume is an over-riding argument. She does not need to justify her decision any further; to say that Guillaume is biax et sages scarcely explains why he deserves that she should sacrifice wealth, position, family and conventions for his sake. It is enough for Aelis that they are childhood sweethearts, and that cist me plaist; the fact that Guillaume is pleasing to her in itself justifies her decision to marry him.

Again, it is in the name of love alone that Aelis feels entitled to oppose her father and his base-born advisers, who have broken off her betrothal to Guillaume :

3246      Mangré iaus iert li mariages,  
              Puis qu'a c'est wenu que je l'aim.  
              Amors nos a pris a son hain  
              Et sachiés a li ambedeus.

Love, too, gives Aelis the courage to take the irreversible step of eloping, for she knows that an elopement is the only way to ensure that she will be able to be with her ami in future. Her hesitation on the night of her flight is presented as a debate between love and reason, in which love triumphs:

3891      Grant hardement li fait emprendre  
             Amors qui ne la laist entendre  
             A paor n'a nule autre chose...  
 3914      ...amors abat et sormonte  
             Son sens et boute tot arriere  
             Raison, et dist : "En quel maniere  
             Puet cis voiajes remanoir?  
 3918      Lairoit on son ami maneir  
             Avuec, se ele estoit remese?  
             Nenil. Dont ne vaut une frese  
             S'el ne fait quanqu'ele a empris.

As we have seen, Blonde's elopement and Clarie's decision to defy her father are motivated by the same unshakeable belief in the importance of love. Admittedly, Aelis also has the moral support, denied to Blonde and Clarie, of telling herself that she is legally in the right : her betrothal was a binding vow, which she must make her father uphold in spite of himself, and must keep for him if necessary (3242-5, 3602-11). However, Jean Renart makes it clear that Aelis is not risking the disgrace of an elopement simply in order to keep her betrothal vows. Her real motive is love, and the knowledge that she cannot be happy with any husband but Guillaume :

3214      Ahi! dous amis, debounaire  
             Por coi nos a on desevrés?  
             C'est por noient : u vos m'avrés  
             U jou avra[i] par tans la mort. (30)

---

(30) I have used the punctuation of the SATF edition, with a colon after noient in line 3216. There is no punctuation in this line in Sweetser's edition.

We are left with a picture of Aelis as a girl who, though deeply distressed by the necessity of flouting her parents' will, nevertheless sees love and happiness in marriage as the supreme goal, whose pursuit needs hardly to be justified. Many other heroines, as well as Blonde, Clarie and Aelis, share this belief in the importance of love. Ydeine, the two Meliors, Romadanaple, La Fièvre, L'Orgueilleuse d'Amors and Ganor of Rome are all prepared to put love before wealth, status, social convention or family affection, as the case may be. In order to marry for love, they will defy fathers, vassals, overlords or unloved suitors, no matter how rich or how powerful. Having once bestowed their love on a deserving young man, they consider that they are justified in seeking to marry him by any practical means, and are no more deterred by his relative poverty or low rank than they are by outside opposition. Love, indeed, takes precedence over all other considerations, and is the overriding reason why a heroine will seek to marry a man of lower rank than herself.

In Florimont, we saw that the issues raised in connexion with the heroine's marriage to a man of lower rank were : the potential disgrace of such a marriage; the honour to be won on the other hand by marrying a great nobleman; the right of a girl to marry a man for his personal qualities, and not for his wealth or status; and the importance to be attached to happiness, and above all to love, in marriage, as opposed to the importance of financial or social gain. Aymon de Varennes also draws attention to the



overwhelming power of love, which gives the heroine strength to face the practical difficulties — opposition from her family or from an unwelcome suitor — which lie in her path. We have seen that the same ideas recur in other romances which deal with the theme of the rich heiress and the poor squire. Although few if any of these other works devote as many lines to the analysis of the situation as does Florimont, they give further examples of the way in which this theme could be treated, and in some cases develop fresh ideas or extend those of Aymon de Varennes. The plea in favour of vavassors in Partonopeus, and the analyses of the decisions of Blonde and Aelis to elope, are examples of this. On the other hand, some brief references in other works may be illuminated by a comparison with the more extensive treatment of the same theme in Florimont; this is true, for instance, of the references to honor in Guillaume de Palerne and L'Escofle, or of the declaration by Amors in Guillaume de Palerne that :

1590      Je ne vois pas par signorie.

In analysing the attitudes of heroines to marriage with men of apparently lower rank than themselves, we have found that certain attitudes are common to all the romances we have examined. All these heroines maintain that, from the point of view of love, personal qualities are far more important than riches or status. They fall in love with the hero for his personal attributes : his noble demeanour, his courage, his courtesy, and especially his good looks. These qualities outweigh any difference in rank,

and convince the heroine that their possessor is worthy to be her lord and husband. Moreover, once she has fallen in love, love itself becomes the heroine's chief reason for wishing to marry the hero. Instead of marrying for financial gain or social prestige, these heroines seek to marry for the sake of love and happiness. In many romances, we find these themes highlighted by a contrast with the heroine's original attitude, which is one of excessive disdain for the "inferior" who loves her. These and other variations, however, do not alter the basic attitudes outlined here, which, as we have said, are common to all the works in which we have studied the theme of the heroine's marriage to a man of lower rank.

Nevertheless, it must be admitted that, in many romances, the problem of the heroine marrying beneath her is an artificial one. The hero is not really an inferior, but is deliberately placed by the author in a situation where his true rank is concealed. An author might adopt this stratagem for several reasons : to give more piquancy to his plot; to demonstrate the purity of his heroine's feelings, since she is prepared to sacrifice rank and riches for love; and to give to the young landless knights in his audience a hero with whom they could readily identify. At the same time, the revelation of the hero's true rank at the end of the work saves the author from appearing to make a radical onslaught on the medieval sense of what sort of marriage was both suitable and realistic for a princess (31). Thus Florimont turns

---

(31) This "conventional" view can be found, for example, in Andreas' comments on the unsuitability of a high-born lady loving beneath her, especially in the third dialogue (Trojel ed., pp.53-5).

out to be a duke's son, Ipomedon, Blancandin and Guillaume de Palerne the sons of kings, and Cristal the son of the lord of Zuave. The girls whom they marry are not desparagées by the match, nor are they finally placed in the unlikely situation of marrying a penniless vagabond. Thus both social convention and verisimilitude are respected, and, after much lip-service to the idea that an heiress should marry for love alone, the author, it seems, draws back from actually showing us his heroine impoverished and degraded by marriage (32). Indeed, as S.Barrow points out, the authors of this type of love-story liked to end by leaving their characters in a "social paradise", where wealth and status combine with love to make the couple ideally happy and fortunate (33). At the end of the story, the opposition between love and money disappears, and the heroine is rewarded for her devotion by finding that she can have both the man she loves and the riches and rank to which she is accustomed.

---

(32) Blonde is the only heroine considered here who is genuinely deparagée by her marriage. However, one notes that Beaumanoir promotes Jehan to the rank of count only a week after their wedding (4901-4998), so that his status is effectively raised to that of Blonde, rather than hers being lowered to his. One might also mention Aelis, who, of course, falls on hard times as a result of her attempt to marry Guillaume, but only temporarily and incidentally. She has in fact taken care before eloping to assure herself that she will be going to a noble position as countess of Normandy (L'Esconfle 3482-3537), and her eventual union with Guillaume in no way worsens her position, but leads to her being mistress both of Normandy and, finally, of the Empire.

(33) The Medieval Society Romances, p.47.

There is one romance on the theme of a poor man's marriage to a rich heiress to which we have not so far referred. This is Guillaume le Clerc's Fergus, in which the hero is not merely poor, but base-born : Fergus is the son of the vilain Soumilloit, and noble only through his mother's line. The reason we have hitherto ignored this work is because it contains, as far as I can discover, no discussion whatsoever of the problems raised by the marriage of the heroine, a queen, to a vilain's son. We are not even told, in so many words, that Fergus' outstanding qualities make up for his low rank, though this is presumably the idea on which Fergus' rise in society is based. One is tempted to suggest that in such a case, where there was no possibility of making all and well by the revelation that the poor knight is a prince in disguise, the author felt it "safer" not to raise the subject at all, and preferred to avoid any unnecessary mention of the fact that his hero's origins are so base as to make his marriage to a queen shocking to a courtly medieval audience. Other authors could play with the fine idea of loving a poor man in defiance of worldly goods and social status, for their audiences were reassuringly aware that the poor man was not really so poor, and certainly not base-born. Guillaume le Clerc, with no such reassurance at his command, leaves the fine idea alone, even though, paradoxically, the marriage of Galiene and Fergus is the only one in this group of romances which really needs to be justified in terms of the primacy of love and personal merit over rank and riches.

### Conclusion

In this study, I have concentrated on only a few aspects of the way marriage is presented in my chosen romances. By looking at marriage from the point of view of the hero and heroine, I have been led to examine marriage as it is seen by those who are as yet unmarried, since the wedding-day of the protagonists marks the end of the great majority of these works (1). I have, therefore, looked at marriage from the outside, asking questions such as: How is marriage formed? What legal and social formalities are required to make a valid marriage? On what criteria is a marriage-partner chosen? Do the criteria of the betrothed couple differ markedly from those of the society around them, and if so, in what ways? What are the effects of social position and fortune on the choice of a marriage-partner? What is the rôle of love in making such a choice, and how closely are love and marriage associated? And, perhaps the hardest to answer : how true a reflection are these works of the matrimonial ideas and practices of the period?

Some of these questions, I consider, have been sufficiently answered in the course of this study, and I do not propose to re-examine them here. On others, particularly on the importance of love, and on the romances as a reflection of medieval life, I should like to make some concluding remarks.

---

(1) An examination of married life, as depicted in such works as Erec et Enide, Athis et Prophilias, Durmart or Floriant et Florete, would form a useful complement to the present thesis.

To our questions about love, I believe that we can reply that love is essential in the case of the hero and heroine, and that for them, love and marriage are almost indissolubly associated. We have seen that most heroines start to think about marriage almost as soon as they have fallen in love; we have seen that, for many heroes, the link between love and marriage is so automatic that it goes without saying, almost as though, in G. Duby's phrase, it "appartient à ce quotidien dont les romans n'ont rien à dire." (2). These heroes and heroines reject any idea of marriage without love; as a rule, they also reject love without marriage, though some may engage in pre-marital affairs with their betrothed.

Our chief protagonists, then, see love as being fundamental to marriage. What of our question about the society around them : are its criteria for choosing a marriage-partner very different from those of the hero and heroine, who consider love first and foremost? We have seen that, indeed, the established members of this society appear to set store by rank, wealth and political alliances when selecting husbands or wives for their dependants. Yet we have also seen, in passing, that other characters besides the hero and heroine also seem at times to take it for granted that marriage will be the fruit of love. The knight in Blancandin, for example, encourages the hero to kiss Orguellose because, if she falls in love with him, she will marry him and make him a king. Urraque, in Partonopeus, assumes that Melior should love the victor of the tournament, for

---

(2) G. Duby, Le Chevalier, la Femme et le Prêtre (Paris 1981), p.239. Duby does not use this expression in connexion with love and marriage; he is referring to the habit of solemnizing marriages before a priest.

he will be her husband. In the same romance, the heroine's vassals commonly speak of the husband to be chosen for Melior as the man whom she will love (see lines 6632, 9894, 10082), and even the vassals of La Fièvre, in Ipomedon, mention love as an important element of marriage (lines 2338, 2390). Thus, although we have found much evidence of love being neglected when marriages are arranged for political and financial reasons, we may also say that even those who arrange such unions assume, when the idea of love does present itself to them, that it is normal for the partners in a marriage to love each other. In other words, the belief that love and marriage go together, which is such a key feature of the attitudes of heroes and heroines, is not completely at variance with the beliefs of the society to which these heroes and heroines belong. Society at large, as the romances show it, does not emphasise love to the exclusion of all else, in the way that the chief protagonists do; on the contrary, society often emphasises other matters to the exclusion of love. But the difference is one of emphasis, not a fundamental disagreement. Our heroes and heroines, once they themselves become members of "the establishment" with the duty of arranging marriages for others, often do so on the grounds of rank and wealth; the emphasis has shifted from the private to the public benefits of marriage, but this does not mean that the two views are incompatible. Similarly, the older generation depicted in these romances is one which neglects love when arranging marriages, but not one which assumes that love ought not to lead to marriage, or that marriage and love are incompatible.

Is this a false picture of the views of the society for which these romances were written, the courtly aristocracy of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries? I believe not. On the contrary, the authors of these works were writing for a public which found it normal and realistic for a feudal lord to speak of his empress "giving her love" to a man, as a synonym for marrying him (Partonopeus 6632 and 10082): a public in which the idea that love leads to marriage was so commonplace that there was no need, when describing a love-lorn hero, for an author to say in so many words that marriage is that hero's goal. These authors were not advancing a totally new concept when they depicted love as leading to marriage. They were simply shifting the emphasis, laying the greatest stress on the one aspect, love, which was normally neglected.

One might, however, argue that these authors were indeed putting forward a new concept, for they were associating marriage with a kind of love, fine amor, which had previously been regarded as being essentially extra-conjugal. Since the presumed adulterous nature of fine amor provided the germ for this thesis (see p. 4 above), and has also provoked much of the critical controversy examined in Part I, I should like here to consider this point again, and explain the conclusions to which my work has led me.

Let us first remind ourselves of the question at issue. I wish to reconsider the assumption that, in connecting love with



marriage, romance writers were deviating from the accepted contemporary doctrine of love. The fine amor of the romances, it is often argued, was descended from Provençal fin'amor, which is essentially adulterous. The writers of romances, apparently, took this established ideal of adulterous love and altered it; by making the love-object a marriageable girl instead of a married woman, they were changing the prevalent concept of love. Thus Erich Köhler writes that: "Dans le Nord de la France...la conception de l'amour courtois transmise par les poètes provençaux dut subir une rectification, afin de pouvoir jouer là aussi un rôle didactique et éthique inattaquable." (3). For J. Coppin, the "esprit provençal" permeated the romances, but suffered a "contamination...ou compromis, en ce sens que c'est assez souvent vers la fiancée ou l'épouse que nos conteurs tournent cette adoration mise à la mode par le lyrisme courtois." (4). Similarly, M. Lazar writes: "Si Chrétien avait écrit dans la seule intention de plaire à son public, pourquoi n'aurait-il pas suivi tout simplement les conceptions en vogue de l'amour courtois? Pourquoi s'est-il attaché à défendre l'idée du mariage d'amour qui, comparée à la conception amoureuse des troubadours, aurait pu être considérée comme 'bourgeoise'?" (5).

I would maintain, on the contrary, that the idea of associating love with marriage did not necessarily involve any

---

(3) Ideal und Wirklichkeit (Tübingen, 1956), trans. by E. Kaufholz as L'Aventure Chevaleresque (Paris, 1974), p. 1163.

(4) Amour et Mariage (Paris, 1961), p. 71.

(5) Amour Courtois et Fin'amors (Paris, 1964), p. 199.

"rectification", "contamination" or "compromis" for the Northern poets. Love and marriage were already closely associated - so closely that these writers had no need to make the association explicit. Far from expecting a "fashionable" adulterous love, the courtly public assumed that love in a romance would lead to marriage. Nor would the idea of a love-marriage seem tamely "bourgeois" to a society where, thanks to the difference in emphasis mentioned above, marriages in real life were too often arranged for political, rather than personal, reasons. The courtly society of the North did not wait for the poets of Provence to tell them about fin'amor; they had their own ideal of a love which ennobled men and inspired them to great deeds, and they also assumed that lovers normally wanted to marry each other.

The great majority of the earliest romances in Old French take this link between love and marriage for granted; Ysmene and Athon, Antigone and Parthenopex, Eneas and Lavinia, Floire and Blanche-flor, Erec and Enide, Athis and Gaite, Alexandre and Soredamors, Ille and Galeron, are all couples who assume that love and marriage go together. Certainly, Provençal ideas had an influence, especially on Thomas' Tristan and on the Charrete, and it is precisely against this influence that the author of Durmart reacts in the passage quoted on p.155 above. However, this influence was exerted on an already-established literary tradition of love leading to marriage.

As so often, it was Jean Frappier who saw most clearly on this issue. He stated that the fine amor of Northern France is not simply an adaptation — or an embourgeoisement — of the troubadours' ideal :

De très notables différences distinguent l'idéal courtois suivant que l'on considère la poésie d'oc ou celle d'oïl... On aurait tort d'attribuer son apparition dans la littérature d'oïl, et plus précisément dans le roman, à l'unique influence des troubadours. La "courtoisie", au sens large du mot, semble s'être constituée spontanément dès la première moitié du XIIe siècle dans les milieux aristocratiques du Nord, sans que le Midi ait exercé réellement d'action. Quant à la peinture de l'amour, elle offre dans les romans courtois des caractères originaux par rapport à la poésie d'oc... [L'amour] ne paraît nullement incompatible avec le mariage... Est-ce à dire que le roman d'oïl soit resté imperméable au concept de la fin'amor adultère? On se doute bien que non. Mais ce produit d'importation n'a exercé au XIIe siècle qu'une influence restreinte, assez tardive... et assez nettement localisée... La courtoisie et l'amour courtois dans la littérature du Nord ne manquent pas de complexité... On peut dire que le courant courtois s'y manifeste avec des caractères particuliers, qu'il y préexiste à l'influence méridionale, que celle-ci n'a pas été... introduite sans causer des remous et des oppositions. (6)

The views here expressed by Frappier are also those to which I have been led. Fine amor in the romances of the langue d'oïl was not simply an adaptation of adulterous Provençal fin'amor.

---

(6) J. Frappier, Amour Courtois et Table Ronde (Geneva 1973), pp.13-15. First published as the article "Vues sur les Conceptions Courtoises dans les littératures d'oc et d'oïl au XIIe siècle", CCM 2 (1959), pp.143-5. Frappier, however, does not follow through the logic of his own argument, for he still refers (Amour Courtois p.14) to the "mariage d'amour" as a "solution de compromis", as though fine amor was indeed an adulterous love which could only be integrated into marriage by a compromise.

It was an indigenous concept, evolved in a society which already associated love and marriage, and which therefore naturally interpreted the new, refined art of loving as a sentiment which was not only compatible with marriage, but for which marriage was the normal, expected outcome. Although Provençal ideas had a strong impact, particularly in the court of Champagne, they did not change the course of the Northern ideal of marriage-oriented love, except to provoke some explicit defence of the wife's position as amie and femme. Still less was this Northern ideal a mere off-shoot of fin'amor, an adaptation of a dominant adulterous ethic to fit a strange new concept of love leading to marriage. Such a view, which leads to the curious spectacle of critics trying to account for that bizarre deviation, the linking of love and marriage, and wondering where such an idea could possibly have come from, must seem on examination to be scarcely tenable.

Having looked at the answers I should like to give to my questions about the importance of love, and incidentally about the differences between society's view of marriage and that of the individual, I would like now to turn to the other question which interests me particularly, that of the degree to which feudal society itself is reflected in the romances I have studied. For my picture of feudal society, I am indebted to the social historian Georges Duby, who has made a particular study of marriage amongst the higher aristocracy of France in the twelfth century (7). Duby's work

---

(7) For a description of Duby's field of study, see pp.x-xi and 1-3 of his book Medieval Marriage: Two Models from Twelfth-century France (Baltimore and London, 1978). This book is the translation, by Elborg Forster, of Duby's lectures at John Hopkins University, and has not been published in this form in French.

has appeared in the article on the "jeunes" (young knights) (8) and in the book Medieval Marriage, to both of which I have already referred in numerous places. In addition, a new work of Duby's has recently been published, the book Le Chevalier, la Femme et le Prêtre (9), which includes and expands the material used for Medieval Marriage, and also includes new material on the ninth to eleventh centuries.

Duby finds that feudal society had its own distinctive pattern of matrimonial practices. This pattern was designed to maintain social stability, to protect the interests of the lignée, and to preserve inheritances intact as far as possible. It was different from the pattern recommended by the Church, but not less coherent or logical. It was, moreover, deeply rooted in feudal society, so that the Church had considerable difficulty in imposing its own conflicting pattern.

One of the principal purposes of the "lay model" of marriage was to preserve a patrimony in one family (10). To this end, the head of the family would normally arrange a marriage for only one of his sons, the eldest. This son would inherit the patrimony; he would also, through his lawfully-espoused wife, beget an heir who would inherit it in his turn. It was essential that these heirs should be legitimate, true descendants of their father, bearers of

---

(8) "Dans la France du Nord au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle : les 'jeunes' dans la société aristocratique", Annales - ESC XIX (1964), pp.835-46. Reprinted in G. Duby, Hommes et Structures du Moyen Age (Paris 1973), pp.213-225. All our references are to the Annales - ECS printing.

(9) Subtitled Le Mariage dans la France féodale; published by Hachette, Paris 1981.

(10) Duby describes this "lay model" in Medieval Marriage, pp.3-12.

the noble blood of the lignee (11); hence the virginity of the bride, and the chastity of the wife, were of paramount importance (12). Another key aspect in the choice of a bride for the eldest son was her own "blood"; if possible, fathers liked to marry their eldest sons to women of nobler birth than themselves, to enhance the nobility of their own line. Needless to say, these well-born girls would also, as a rule, bring with them a good dowry.

For younger sons, however, the matrimonial strategy was very different. Unless they entered the Church, these young men were destined to spend many years as unmarried wanderers, with no establishment, no fixed abode, no regular income. Arranging marriages for such sons meant setting them up with their own lands and revenues, and thus depleting the patrimony; fathers were, therefore, strongly disinclined to allow such marriages (13). These young knights, dependent on the spoils of fighting and on the generosity of a lord for their subsistence, are the povres bachelers one meets in certain chansons de geste, and whose plight is lamented so movingly by Guillaume in Le Charroi de Nîmes (14). The great ambition of the bachelor was to found a lignee of his own, to acquire the wife and lands which would give him a settled

---

(11) On marriage as the means of transmitting the nobility of the line, see Le Chevalier, la Femme et le Prêtre, pp.42-3.

(12) See Medieval Marriage, p.7: "It was of the utmost importance that a wife receive only one seed, that of her husband".

(13) "Les 'jeunes' dans la société aristocratique", pp.841-2.

(14) Le Charroi de Nîmes, ed. D.McMillan, 2nd edition (Paris 1978), lines 80-93 and 252-260. A helpful description of the condition of bachelor is given by J. Flori in his article "Qu'est-ce qu'un 'bachelor'?", Romania 96 (1975) pp.289-314.

place in the social structure, would make him in his turn the head of a household, respected and established. But how were these young men to win the femme et terre which would realise their dream? One method was to serve a rich lord, in the hope of being rewarded by the bestowal of a wife and lands (15). Another was to find a marriageable girl with lands of her own, an heiress, and snap her up before she could be married off to an elder son (16). Hence "these bachelors were abductors by their very nature, for they were always tempted to take by force from another household the wife that would make them, at last, into elders (seniores)." (17).

Where daughters were concerned, the marriage strategy was different again. The heads of households tried to marry off as many of their daughters as possible, in order to widen their network of kinship alliances. These girls "had, after all, been brought into the world precisely because they could be transplanted... into fertile ground where they could bring forth the illustrious offspring who in turn would become attached to the family trunk by the feelings of special affection they owed their maternal uncles." (18). As a result, there were far more females than males on the "marriage market". The choice of husbands was therefore limited, and girls had often to be given to men of lower rank than themselves.

---

(15) As Duby shows in Le Chevalier, la Femme et le Prêtre pp.251-4, the vassals of the twelfth century saw the good overlord as one who rewarded his followers with a rich marriage.

(16) "Les 'jeunes' dans la société aristocratique", pp.842-3.

(17) Medieval Marriage p.13.

(18) Ibid., p.99.

In all this complex marriage policy, the power lay with the men who were already married, the heads of households. These prudent fathers negotiated advantageous marriages for their elder sons, while refusing to younger sons any share of the patrimony which would enable them to set themselves up and take wives of their own. Their power was particularly strongly exerted over daughters, whose sole utility was to be given in marriage to a family from whose connexion the father hoped to gain an advantage. The perils of the warrior life led by the sons, however, meant that many of these girls themselves became heiresses, whose marriage was even more strictly controlled by the head of the household (19).

This, it seems to me, is very much the picture which my study of the romances has revealed. However, the picture found in the romances is a double image. It is both a reflection of reality, depicting the marriage practices of the feudal aristocracy very much as they were in real life; and also a reflection of the ideal, showing how some members of that society dreamed about marriage, the kind of marriage they would have hoped for in a perfect world.

On the level of reality, we have noted, for example, the importance attached to the virginity of the bride, and we have seen that this appears to be a key issue particularly when the hero is a great nobleman, with an established social position, marrying beneath him. Such heroes can be seen as the literary

---

(19) The relative frequency with which domains were inherited by surviving daughters is noted by Duby in "Les 'jeunes' dans la société aristocratique", pp.843-4.



equivalent of the elder son, the man with a rich inheritance who can pick and choose amongst potential brides, but who is also charged with the duty of transmitting his inheritance and his noble blood to legitimate heirs, and must therefore have a chaste wife. We have seen that the rank and fortune of both partners in the marriage is a capital issue, and that, generally, the bride in a romance is nobler than the groom, as so often happened at the period. We have also seen that the heroes of these romances tend often to be poor knights, wandering in foreign courts in search of fame, fortune and wives. Often, these young knights look to their overlord to give them a wife, for they have fallen in love with the one girl who, more than any other, is at that lord's disposal : his own daughter. Moreover, when our heroes become lords themselves, one of their first duties is to give wives and lands to those who have served them. If, however, the coveted bride is not freely given, the hero is often tempted to become an abductor: Guillaume de Palerne, Guillaume de Normandie, Jehan and Floriant all win their brides in this way, and abduction is also the first solution proposed by Cligès and Amadas to their own wife-winning problems.

Heroines, like heroes, reflect social reality. There is no question of their remaining unmarried; as bearers of noble blood, they are valuable assets, and destined to be given to suitable husbands. As in reality, however, these husbands may often turn out to be of lower rank than themselves. In any case, their

freedom of choice is very limited; their husband is chosen for them by their father, brother or vassals, and their attempts at marrying the man of their choice have to be elaborately devious in order to succeed, and also in order to avoid the censure heaped by society on the girl who marries par soi instead of par conseil. And, of course, these heroines are frequently heiresses.

The status of the heroine is, perhaps, the point at which romances cease to reflect reality, and begin instead to reflect the dream. This dream, it should be noted, is not that of the poor girl seeing herself as a great heiress; it is the dream of the poor knight, who longs to marry such an heiress. Duby has shown that such a prospect was the summit of a poor knight's wishes. Our romances are the fulfilment of those wishes, the projection of that dream; in the great majority of them, the poor knight does indeed marry the heiress. But how, in reality, was a poor knight to win an heiress from a powerful father, who would scarcely consider marrying her to a younger son? By abduction, certainly : but how much finer if the girl herself fell in love with the poor knight, and schemed successfully to give herself to him! Thus the typical plot of these marital romances appears to fulfil a need for a certain male fantasy, in which a rich and beautiful girl, still providentially available because her father has failed to marry her off or because, better still, she has no father, falls for a poor but courageous youth, flouts all her male guardians, (who, if not her father himself, are of her father's generation, the

enemies of the young), and bestows on the young man her self, her love and her fortune. To make the fantasy complete, the young hero, whose poverty and wandering life make him seem a typical landless younger son, turns out in the end to be a lord in his own right, an elder son with an inheritance of his own.

Obviously, not all the elements of this fantasy are present in all our romances. Nevertheless, the basic outline can be seen in enough of them for us to see that these works are, in many respects, a literature of wish-fulfilment for that large class of rootless bachelers which Duby has described. No doubt the romances in which the hero is of higher rank also served the same purpose for elder sons, allowing them to dream of being free to choose their own brides, and of finding a chaste and lovely girl who would marry them for love, not for their lands. No doubt, too, the longing of the feudal lady for the same freedom of choice and pre-eminence of love in marriage was also catered for by the situation accorded to heroines in the romances we have examined. However, the central myth is that of the poor knight whose valour wins him an heiress in marriage, and it is to such poor knights that these works must specially have appealed.

Another aspect of Duby's work, expounded particularly in Medieval Marriage and in Le Chevalier, la Femme et le Prêtre, is his analysis of the conflict between the "two models of marriage", that of the nobility and that of the Church. Duby shows that the Church model was imposed only slowly, with difficulty, and with

many compromises. This, too, is reflected in our romances. In our comparison of these texts with contemporary canon law, we have seen time and again that the feudal aristocracy depicted in these works is relatively ignorant of Church doctrine, and clings instead to an older view of marriage, in which, for example, consent is of small account, the copula is a key element in the formation of marriage, the crime of adultery makes a woman incapable of contracting a new marriage, and a man is free to marry again if his wife becomes a nun. Similarly, the exploitation of the impediment of consanguinity in Amadas, and that romance's picture of an annulment being arranged by the lay lords involved, and merely ratified by the bishops, fits remarkably well with the precarious nature of the Church's hold over feudal society in this matter, as described by Duby. Thus we can, I believe, conclude that these romances do indeed reflect aspects of life and matrimonial practices of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, both as it was in reality and as the men and women of the time dreamed it could be.

In the first chapter of Le Chevalier, la Femme et le Prêtre, Duby laments the fact that the sources for his history of feudal society are nearly all ecclesiastical ones. "Je suis contraint", he writes "de ne voir jamais ce qui m'intéresse, les manières de penser et de vivre des guerriers, que par les yeux des prêtres (p.19)... Ce que l'on peut percevoir des conduites matrimoniales parvient de l'extérieur, le plus souvent en négatif, par l'entremise de condamnations ou d'admonestations à changer d'habitudes." (p.25).

Yet the romances studied here, I believe, do indeed show us "les manières de penser et de vivre" and the "conduites matrimoniales" of the warriors, and of their ladies. The present thesis is intended, first and foremost, as a work of literary criticism; nevertheless, in treating a subject so fundamental to the structure of society, it may also perhaps bring some fresh evidence to the field of social history.

Texts used for this Study

Listed in alphabetical order of title. For details of editions used, see Bibliography.

Amadas et Ydoine

Alexandre de Bernai, Athis et Prophilias

Renaut de Beaujeu, Le Bel Inconnu

Blancandin et l'Orgueilleuse d'Amour

Claris et Laris

Adenet le Roi, Cleomadès

Chrétien de Troyes, Cligès

Cristal et Clarie

Durmart le Galois

Eneas

Gautier d'Arras, Eracle

Chrétien de Troyes, Erec et Enide

Girart d'Amiens, Escanor

Jean Renart, L'Escoufle

Guillaume le Clerc, Fergus

Floire et Blancheflor

Floriant et Florete

Aimon de Varennes, Florimont

Renaut, Galeran de Bretagne

Gliglois

Guillaume d'Angleterre

Jean Renart, Guillaume de Dole

Guillaume de Palerne

Gui de Warewic

Gautier d'Arras, Ille de Galeron

Hue de Rotelande, Ipomedon

Philippe de Beaumanoir, Jehan et Blonde

Marie de France, Lais

Philippe de Beaumanoir, La Manekine

Raoul de Houdenc, Meraugis de Portlesgues

Partonopeus de Blois

Hue de Rotelande, Protheselaus

Sone de Nansay

Gerbert de Montreuil, La Violette

Yder

Chrétien de Troyes, Yvain.

Abbreviations

<u>Annales - ESC</u>	<u>Annales - Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations</u>
<u>art. cit.</u>	article quoted
<u>AUMLA</u>	<u>Journal of the Australasian Universities' Modern Language and Literature Association</u>
<u>BFR</u>	<u>Bibliothèque Française et Romane</u>
<u>BLVS</u>	<u>Bibliothek des Litterarischen Vereins in Stuttgart</u>
<u>CCM</u>	<u>Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale</u>
<u>CFMA</u>	<u>Classiques Français du Moyen Age</u>
<u>cp.</u>	compare
<u>DDC</u>	<u>Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique</u>
<u>DTC</u>	<u>Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique</u>
<u>ed.</u>	edition; edited by
<u>ed. cit.</u>	edition quoted
<u>et al.</u>	and others
<u>f., ff.</u>	and the following line(s)
<u>FEW</u>	<u>Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch, ed. Wartburg</u>
<u>FMLS</u>	<u>Forum for Modern Language Studies</u>
<u>GRL</u>	<u>Gesellschaft für Romanische Literatur</u>
<u>HLF</u>	<u>Histoire Littéraire de la France, par des religieux bénédictins...</u>
<u>l., ll.</u>	line(s)
<u>ms., mss.</u>	manuscript(s)
<u>op. cit.</u>	work quoted
<u>P</u>	<u>Ille et Galeron, Paris ms.</u>
<u>p., pp.</u>	page(s)
<u>PL</u>	<u>Patrologia Latina, ed. Migne</u>
<u>PMLA</u>	<u>Publications of the Modern Language Association of America</u>
<u>PRF</u>	<u>Publications Romanes et Françaises</u>
<u>SATF</u>	<u>Société des Anciens Textes Français</u>
<u>TL</u>	<u>Tobler-Lommatzsch, Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch</u>
<u>TLF</u>	<u>Textes Littéraires Français</u>
<u>trans., transl.</u>	translated by
<u>var.</u>	variant
<u>W</u>	<u>Ille et Galeron, Wollaton Hall ms.</u>

# Bibliography

## I. Texts (Medieval, Classical, Religious etc) (1)

- Adenet le Roi, Oeuvres vol. V: Cleomadés, ed. A. Henry, Brussels 1971 (Université de Bruxelles, Travaux de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres, vol. XLVI)
- Alexandre de Bernai, Athis et Prophlias, ed. A. Hilka, 2 vols, Halle 1912-16 (GRL 29 and 40)
- Amadas et Ydoine, ed. J. R. Reinhard, Paris 1926 (CFMA 51)
- Les Anciens Usages d'Anjou, ed. M.A.J. Marnier, Paris 1853
- Andreas Capellanus, De Amore Libri Tres, ed. E. Trojel, Munich 1964 (repr. of Copenhagen, 1892, edition)
- The Art of Courtly Love, trans. J.J. Parry, New York 1941, repr. 1970
- Traité de l'Amour Courtois, trans. C. Buridant, Paris 1974 (BFR 9)
- Assises et Bons Usages du Royaume de Jerusalem, ed. Jean d'Ibelin, Bourges 1690
- L'Atre Périlleux, ed. B. Woledge, Paris 1936 (CFMA 76)
- Aucassin et Nicolette, ed. M. Roques, 2nd edition, Paris 1962 (CFMA 41)
- Aymon de Varennes, Florimont, ed. A. Hilka, Göttingen 1932 (GRL 48)
- Beaumanoir, Philippe de Remi, sire de: Les Coutumes de Beauvaisis, ed. A. Salmon, 2 vols, Paris 1899-1900 (Collection de Textes pour servir à l'étude et à l'enseignement de l'histoire, 24 and 30)
- Oeuvres Poétiques, ed. H. Suchier, 2 vols, Paris 1884-5 (SATF) (Vol. I: La Manekine; vol. II: Jehan et Blonde)
- Benoit de Sainte-Maure, Le Roman de Troie, ed. L. Constans, 6 vols, Paris 1904-12 (SATF)
- Beroul, Tristan, ed. A. Ewert, 2 vols, Oxford 1939-70
- Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Clementinam, ed. A. Colunga and L. Turrado, Madrid 1951
- The Holy Bible, Authorised King James Version, ed. H.A. Redpath, London 19??
- Blancandin et l'Orgueilleuse d'Amour, ed. Franklin P. Sweetser, Geneva and Paris 1964 (TLF 112)
- Causa Viri Ementulati et eius uxoris petentis fieri divorcium, ed. M.L. Colker, Medievalia et Humanistica XII (1958) pp. 11-15
- Le Charroi de Nîmes, ed. D. McMillan, 2nd edition, Paris 1978 (BFR Série B, 112)
- La Chastelaine de Vergi, ed. F. Whitehead, 2nd edition, Manchester 1951, repr. 1974
- Chrétien (de Troyes), Guillaume d'Angleterre, ed. M. Wilmotte, Paris 1927 (CFMA 55)
- Chrétien de Troyes, Sämtliche Erhaltene Werke, ed. W. Foerster, 4 vols, Halle 1884-9, repr. Amsterdam 1965 (vol. I: Cliges; vol. II: Der Löwenritter (Yvain); vol. III: Erec und Enide; vol. IV: Der Karrenritter)

(1) ↓ have listed works by the most usual form of the name of the author or of the title, e.g. Philippe de Remi as Beaumanoir, Le Roman de Thèbes under Thèbes. Where two or more editions of the same work are listed, an asterisk indicates the edition used for quotation and reference in this thesis.



- \*Chrétien de Troyes, Les Romans, édités d'après la copie de Guiot, 6 vols, Paris 1952-75 (CFMA 80, 84, 86, 89, 100, 103) (vol. I: Erec et Enide, ed. M. Roques; vol. II: Cliges, ed. A. Micha; vol. IV: Le Chevalier au Lion (Yvain), ed. M. Roques)
- Yvain (Le Chevalier au Lion), ed. T.B.W. Reid, Manchester 1942
- Claris et Laris, ed. J. Alton, Tübingen 1884 (BLVS 169)
- Le Comte de Poitiers, ed. B. Malmberg, Lund 1940 (Etudes Romanes de Lund I)
- Conon de Bethune, Les Chansons, ed. A. Wallensköld, Paris 1921 (CFMA 24)
- Consuetudines Feudorum (Libri Feudorum, Jus Feudale Langobardorum), ed. C. Lehmann, Göttingen 1892
- Corpus Juris Canonici, ed. A.L. Richter and A. Friedberg, 2 vols, Leipsig 1879-81
- Coutumiers de Normandie, ed. E-J. Tardif, 2 pts, Rouen and Paris 1881-1903
- Cristal et Clarie, ed. H. Breuer, Dresden 1915 (GRL 36)
- Dares Phrygius, De Excidio Troiae, ed. A. Dederich, Bonn 1835
- Drouart la Vache, Li Livres d'Amours, ed. R. Bossuat, Paris 1926
- Durmart le Gallois, ed. J. Gildea, 2 vols, Villanova, Pa, 1965-6
- Le Roman d'Eneas, ed. J-J. Salverda de Grave, 2 vols, Paris 1925-31 (CFMA 44 and 62)
- Les Etablissements de St Louis, ed. P. Viollet, 4 vols, Paris 1881-6
- Floire et Blancheflor, ed. M. Pelan, 2nd edition, Paris 1956
- seconde version, ed. M. Pelan. Paris 1975 (Association des Publications près l'Université de Strasbourg)
- The Romance of Floire and Blancheflor, trans. M.J. Hubert, Chapel Hill, N. Carolina, 1966 (University of North Carolina Studies in the Romance Languages and Literatures, 63)
- Floriant et Florete, ed. Harry F. Williams, Ann Arbor, Mich., 1947 (University of Michigan Publications, Series in Language and Literature, 23)
- La Folie Tristan de Berne, ed. E. Hoepffner, 2nd edition, Paris 1949 (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, Textes d'Etude, 3)
- Pierre de Fontaines, Conseil a un Amy, ed. A.J. Marnier, Paris 1846
- Gautier d'Arras, Oeuvres, ed. E. Löseth, 2 vols, Paris 1890 (Bibliothèque Française du Moyen Age 6 and 7)
- \*----- Eracle, ed. G. Raynaud de Lage, Paris 1976 (CFMA 102)
- \*----- Ille et Galeron, ed. W. Foerster, Halle 1891 (Romanische Bibliothek VII)
- \*-----, -----, ed. F.A.G. Cowper, Paris 1956 (SATF)
- Gerbert de Montreuil, Le Roman de la Violette ou de Gérard de Nevers, ed. Douglas Labarée Buffum, Paris 1928 (SATF)
- Girart d'Amiens, Escanor, ed. H. Michelant, Tübingen 1886 (BLVS 178)
- Gliglois, ed. C.H. Livingston, Cambridge, Mass., 1932
- Gui de Warewic, ed. A. Ewert, 2 vols, Paris 1932-3 (CFMA 74-5)
- Guillaume de Palerne, ed. H. Michelant, Paris 1876 (SATF)

- Guillaume le Clerc, Fergus, ed. E. Martin, Halle 1872
- Hue de Rotelande, Ipomedon, ed. E. Kölbing and E. Koschwitz, Breslau 1889
- \*-----, -----, ed. A.J. Holden, Paris 1979 (BFR Série B, 17)
- , Protheselaus, ed. F. Kluckow, Göttingen 1924 (GRL 45)
- Jean Renart, L'Escoufle, ed. H. Michelant and P. Meyer, Paris 1894 (SATF)
- \*-----, -----, ed. F. Sweetser, Geneva 1974 (TLF 211)
- , Galeran de Bretagne : see Renaut.
- , Le Roman de la Rose ou de Guillaume de Dole, ed. F. Lecoy, Paris 1962 (CFMA 91)
- A. Jeanroy, A. Langfors, eds: Recueil Général des Jeux-Partis Français, 2 vols in 1, Paris 1926 (SATF)
- Jerome, Adversus Jovinianum Libri Duo, in Opera Omnia, II, ed. J-P. Migne, PL 23, Paris 1883, cols 221-352
- Joufroi de Poitiers, ed. P.B. Fay and John L. Grigsby, Geneva 1972 (TLF 183)
- Li Livres de Jostice et de Plet, ed. P.N. Rapetti, Paris 1850 (Collection de Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France, 78)
- \*Marie de France, Lais, ed. A. Ewert, Oxford 1947, repr. 1960
- , -----, ed. Jeanne Lods, Paris 1959 (CFMA 87)
- , -----, ed. Jean Rychner, Paris 1966 (CFMA 93)
- E. Martène, ed.: De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus, 2nd edition, 4 vols, Antwerp 1736-8
- J. Morawski, ed.: Proverbes Français Antérieurs au XVe siècle, Paris 1925 (CFMA 47)
- Ovid, The Art of Love, and Other Poems, with a translation by J.H. Mozley, 2nd edition, revised by G.P. Gould, London and Cambridge, Mass., 1979 (Loeb Classical Library 232)
- , Heroides and Amores, with a translation by G. Showerman, London and New York, 1914 (Loeb Classical Library 41)
- , Metamorphoses, with an English translation by F.J. Miller, 2 vols, London 1916-26 (Loeb Classical Library 42 and 43)
- Partonopeus de Blois, ed. G-A. Crapelet and A.C.M. Robert, 2 vols, Paris 1834
- \*-----, ed. J. Gildea, 2 vols, Villanova, Pa., 1967-8
- F. Rabelais, Le Tiers Livre, ed. M.A. Screech, Geneva 1964 (TLF 102)
- Raoul de Houdenc, Sämtliche Werke, ed. M. Friedwagner, 2 vols, Halle 1897-1909 (vol. I: Meraugis de Portlesgueiz; vol. II: La Vengeance Raguidel)
- Renaut, Galeran de Bretagne, ed. L. Foulet, Paris 1925 (CFMA 37)
- Renaut de Beaujeu, Le Bel Inconnu, ed. G. Perrie Williams, Paris 1929 (CFMA 38)
- Sone de Nansay, ed. M. Goldschmidt, Tübingen 1899 (BLVS 216)
- Le Roman de Thèbes, ed. L. Constans, 2 vols, Paris 1890 (SATF)
- , ed. G. Raynaud de Lage, 2 vols, Paris 1966-8 (CFMA 94 and 96)
- La Très Ancienne Coutume de Bretagne, ed. M. Planiol, Rennes 1896 (Bibliothèque Bretonne Armoricaïne, publiée par la Faculté des Lettres de Rennes, fasc. 2)

Virgil, Aeneid, with a translation by H. Rushton Fairclough, 2nd edition, 2 vols, Cambridge, Mass. and London 1935, repr. 1978

Yder, ed. H. Gelzer, Dresden 1913 (GRL 31)

## II. Modern Works

Alison Adams, "Amadas et Ydoine and Thomas' Tristan", FMLS XIV (1978), pp. 246-254

A. Adler, "Sovereignty as the Principle of Unity in Chrétien's Erec", PMLA 60 (1945), pp. 917-936

M.C. Albrecht, "The Relationship of Literature and Society", American Journal of Sociology LIX (1954), pp. 425-436

J.M. Allinson, A Literary Study of the "Roman d'Eracle" by Gautier d'Arras, M.Phil. thesis, London University, 1968

Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages: a collaborative history, ed. R.S. Loomis, Oxford 1959

Sarah F. Barrow, The Medieval Society Romances, New York 1924

L. Beauchet, "Etude Historique sur les Formes de la Célébration du Mariage dans l'Ancien Droit Français", RHDFE 3rd series, vol 6 (1882), pp. 351-393 and 631-683

R.R. Bezzola, "Guillaume IX et les Origines de l'Amour Courtois", Romania 66 (1940), pp. 145-237

-----, Les Origines et Formation de la Littérature Courtoise en Occident (500-1200), 6 vols, Paris 1944-63 (Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes: Sciences Historiques et Philologiques, 286, 313, 319-20)

-----, Le Sens de l'Aventure et de l'Amour (Chrétien de Troyes), second edition, Paris 1968

Marc Bloch, La Société Féodale, 2nd edition, 2 vols, Paris 1949 (L'Evolution de l'Humanité, synthèse collective, 34)

R. Howard Bloch, Medieval French Literature and Law, Berkeley, Calif., 1977

Roger Boase, The Origin and Meaning of Courtly Love: a Critical Study of European Scholarship, Manchester 1977

Robert Bossuat, Manuel Bibliographique de la Littérature Française du Moyen Age, Melun 1951 (Bibliothèque Elzevirienne Nouvelle Série: Etudes et Documents)

-----, -----, Supplément (1949-53), avec le concours de Jacques Monfrin, Paris 1945

-----, -----, Second Supplément (1954-60), Paris 1961

-----, Le Moyen Age : see Histoire de la Littérature Française

Constance B. Bouchard, "Consanguinity and Noble Marriages in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries", Speculum 56 (1981), pp. 268-287

Gabriel J. Brogyanyi, "Motivation in Erec et Enide: an Interpretation of the Romance", Kentucky Romance Quarterly 19 (1972), pp. 407-431

Christopher Brooke, The Twelfth Century Renaissance, London 1969

G.H. Brown, "Yvain's Sin of Neglect", Symposium 27 (1973), pp. 309-321

James Douglas Bruce, The Evolution of Arthurian Romance from the Beginnings down to the year 1300, 2nd edition, 2 vols, Göttingen and Baltimore 1928 (Hesperia Ergänzungsreihe: Schriften zur englischen Philologie, 8 and 9)

Glyn S. Burgess, Contribution à l'étude du Vocabulaire Pré-courtois, Geneva 1970 (PRF 110)

-----, Marie de France: an Analytical Bibliography, London 1977 (Research Bibliographies and Checklists, 21)

-----, "Orgueil and Fierté in Twelfth-Century French", Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie 89 (1973), pp. 103-122

-----, "Talent in early Old French (to 1150)", Romania XCV (1974), pp. 443-466

W.C. Calin, "On the Chronology of Gautier d'Arras", Modern Language Quarterly 20 (1959), pp. 181-96

J. de Caluwé, J. Wathelet-Willem, "La Conception de l'Amour dans les 'Lais' de Marie. Quelques aspects du problème", in Mélanges de Langue et Littérature Françaises du Moyen Age offerts à P. Jonin, Aix-en-Provence 1979 (Senefiance 7), pp. 139-158

The Catholic Encyclopedia, ed. C. Hebermann et al., 16 vols, New York 1907-1922

G. Charlier, "L'Escoufle et Guillaume de Dole", in Mélanges de Philologie Romane et d'Histoire Littéraire offerts à M. Wilmette, 2 vols, Paris 1910, vol. I, pp. 81-98

Emile Chénon, Histoire Générale du Droit Français public et privé des origines à 1815, 2 vols, Paris 1926-9 (vol. II ed. F. Olivier-Martin)

-----, "Recherches Historiques sur quelques Rites Nuptiaux", RHDFE 36 (1912), pp. 373-660

G. Cohen, Un Grand Romancier d'Amour et d'Aventure au XIIe siècle: Chrétien de Troyes et son Oeuvre, Paris 1931

Alice M. Colby, The Portrait in Twelfth-century French Literature: an example of the stylistic originality of Chrétien de Troyes, Geneva 1965

J.P. Collas, "The Romantic Hero of the Twelfth Century", in Medieval Miscellany presented to E. Vinaver, Manchester and New York 1965, pp. 80-96

W.W. Comfort, "The Literary Role of the Saracens in the French Epic", PMLA 55 (1940), pp. 628-659

Joseph Coppin, Amour et Mariage dans la Littérature Française du Nord au Moyen Age, Paris 1961 (Bibliothèque Elzevirienne nouvelle série: Etudes et Documents)

O.M. Dalton, Catalogue of the Finger Rings in the British Museum, Early Christian, Medieval and Later, London 1912

J. Dauvillier, "Le Consentement Seigneurial au Mariage des Vassaux, et particulièrement des vassals, dans les textes normands", RHDFE XIV (1935) pp. 795-8

-----, Le Mariage dans le Droit Classique de l'Eglise depuis le Décret de Gratien, 1140, jusqu'à la mort de Clément V, 1314, Paris 1933

M. Delbouille, "A Propos de la patrie et de la Date de Floire et Blancheflor", in Mélanges de Linguistique et de Littérature Romanes offerts à Mario Roques, 4 vols, Paris 1950-52, vol IV, pp. 53-98

A.J. Denomy, "Courtly Love and Courtliness", Speculum 28 (1953), pp. 44-63

-----, "An Enquiry into the Origins of Courtly Love", Medieval Studies VI (1944), pp. 175-260

Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, ed. William Smith and Samuel Cheetham, 2 vols, London 1875-80

Dictionnaire d'Archéologie et de Liturgie, ed. Fernand Cabrol and Henri Leclercq, 15 vols, Paris 1907-1953

Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique, ed. R. Naz, 7 vols, Paris 1935-65

Dictionnaire des Lettres Françaises, ed. Georges Grente, vol. I: Le Moyen Age, by R. Bossuat et al., Paris 1964

Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, ed. A. Vacant and E. Mangenot, 15 vols, Paris 1923-50

A.H. Diverres, "Chivalry and fin'amor in Le Chevalier au Lion", in Studies in Medieval Literature and Languages in memory of F. Whitehead, Manchester 1973, pp. 91-116

Georges Duby, Le Chevalier, la Femme et le Prêtre: le mariage dans la France Féodale, Paris 1981

-----, "Dans la France du nord-ouest au XIIe siècle: les 'Jeunes' dans la Société Aristocratique", Annales - ESC XIX (1964), pp. 835-46

-----, Hommes et Structures du Moyen Age. Recueil d'articles, Paris 1973 (Ecole Pratique de Hautes Etudes VIe section: Sciences Economiques et Sociales Le Savoir Historique, I)

-----, Medieval Marriage; Two Models from Twelfth-century France, trans. Elborg Forster, Baltimore and London 1978 (Johns Hopkins Symposia in Comparative History, 11)

-----, "Remarques sur la Littérature Généalogique en France aux XIe et XIIe siècles", Comptes Rendus des Séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, 1967, pp. 335-345

-----, "Structures de Parenté et de Noblesse dans la France du Nord aux XIe et XIIe siècles", in Miscellanea Medievalia in memoriam Jan Frederik Niermayer, Groningen 1967, pp. 149-166

Charles W. Dunn, The Foundling and the Werewolf, a literary-historical study of "Guillaume de Palerne", Toronto 1960 (University of Toronto Department of English: Studies and Texts, 8)

A. Duplat, "Etude Stylistique des Apostrophes adressées aux Personnages Féminins dans les Romans de Chrétien de Troyes", CCM XVII (1974), pp. 129-52

-----, "Etude Stylistique des Formules de Salutation chez Chrétien de Troyes", Travaux de Linguistique et de Littérature XIII (1975), pp. 107-143

A. Esmein, Le Mariage en Droit Canonique, 2 vols, Paris 1891

-----, -----, 2nd edition, by R. Génestal and J. Dauvillier, 2 vols, Paris 1935

Joan Evans, Life in Medieval France, revised edition, London 1957

E. Faral, Recherches sur les Sources Latines des Contes et Romans Courtois, Paris 1913

La Femme dans les Civilisations des Xe-XIIIe siècles, Actes du Colloque tenu à Poitiers, sept. 1976, in CCM XX (1977), pp. 93-263

Joan M. Ferrante, Woman as Image in Medieval Literature from the Twelfth Century to Dante, New York and London 1975

J. Flori, "Qu'est-ce qu'un bachelor?", Romania 96 (1975), pp. 289-314

W. Foerster, "Randglossen zum Athisroman", Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie 36 (1912), pp. 727-36

-----, Wörterbuch zu Kristian von Troyes' Sämtlichen Werken, 2nd edition, ed. Hermann Breuer, Halle 1933 (Romanische Bibliothek 21)

- L. Foulet, Glossary to the Continuations of the Old French "Perceval" of Chrétien de Troyes, Philadelphia 1955 (The Continuations..., ed. W. Roach, vol. III, pt 2)
- A. Fourrier, Le Courant Réaliste dans le Roman Courtois en France au Moyen Age, vol. I : Les Débuts (XIIe siècle), Paris 1960
- , "Retour au 'Terminus'", in Mélanges de Langue et de Littérature du Moyen Age offerts à J. Frappier, 2 vols, Geneva 1970, pp. 299-311 (PRF 112)
- Robin Fox, Kinship and Marriage, an anthropological perspective, London 1967
- Jean Frappier, Amour Courtois et Table Ronde, Geneva 1973 (PRF 126)
- , Chrétien de Troyes, 2nd edition, Paris 1968 (Connaissance des Lettres, 50)
- , Etude sur "Yvain ou le Chevalier au Lion" de Chrétien de Troyes, Paris 1969
- , Le Roman Breton. Chrétien de Troyes, "Cligès", Paris 1951 (Les Cours de Sorbonne)
- , Le Roman Breton. Introduction: des Origines à Chrétien de Troyes, Paris 1959 (Les Cours de Sorbonne)
- , Le Roman Breton. Yvain, ou le Chevalier au Lion, Paris 1952 (Les Cours de Sorbonne)
- , "Sur un Procès fait à l'Amour Courtois", Romania 93 (1972) pp. 145-193
- , "Vues sur les Conceptions Courtoises dans les Littératures d'oc et d'oïl au XIIe siècle", CCM II (1959), pp. 135-156
- Lionel J. Friedman, "Occulta Cordis", Romance Philology XI (1957-8), pp. 103-119
- P. Gallais, "Recherches sur la Mentalité des Romanciers français du Moyen Age: les Formules et le Vocabulaire des Prologues. I: l'Auteur et son Public", CCM VII (1964), pp. 479-493
- , "Recherches sur la Mentalité des Romanciers français du Moyen Age, II: le Public et les Destinataires", CCM 13 (1970), pp. 333-347
- E. Gamillscheg, Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Französischen Sprache, 2nd edition, Heidelberg 1969
- Lucy M. Gay, "Hue de Rotelande's "Ipomedon" and Chrétien de Troyes", PMLA 32 (1917), pp. 468-491
- John Gilissen, "Le Statut de la Femme dans l'Ancien Droit belge", in La Femme, II, Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin XII (1962), pp. 255-321
- F. Godefroy, Dictionnaire de l'Ancienne Langue Française, 10 vols, Paris 1880-1902
- A. Grisay, G. Lavis, M. Dubois-Stasse, Les Dénominations de la Femme dans les Anciens Textes Littéraires français, Gembloux 1969 (Publications de l'Institut de Lexicologie Française de l'Université de Liège)
- Patricia B. Grout, "The Trial of Daire and <sup>the</sup> Dating of the Roman de Thèbes", French Studies XIV (1965), pp. 392-5
- Grundriss der Romanischen Literatur des Mittelalters, ed. H.R. Jauss and E. Koehler, vol. 4: Le Roman jusqu'à la Fin du XIIIe siècle, ed. J. Frappier, Heidelberg 1978
- R. Guiette, "Pour une Nouvelle Approche des Textes du Moyen Age", in Robert Guiette, Forme et Seneffiance, ed. J. Dufournet et al., Geneva 1978
- , Questions de Littérature seconde série, Ghent 1972 (Romanica Gandensia XIII)

- Robert Guiette, "Sur Quelques Vers de Cligès", Romania 91 (1970), pp. 75-83
- Mireille Guillet-Rydell, "L'Épopée Nuptiale dans quelques Oeuvres français du Moyen Âge", Dissertation Abstracts 30 (1969-70), 695A
- , "Nature et Rôle du Mariage dans les Lais Anonymes bretons", Romania 96 (1975), pp. 91-104
- Peter Haidu, Aesthetic Distance and Chrétien de Troyes: Irony and Comedy in "Cligès" and "Perceval", Geneva 1968
- J. Halligan, "Marriage in Chrétien's Yvain", AUMLA 36 (1970), pp. 264-285
- R.W. Hanning, "The Social Significance of Twelfth-century Chivalric Romance", Medievalia et Humanistica III (1972), pp. 3-29
- Geneviève d'Haucourt, La Vie au Moyen Âge, Paris 1957 (Que Sais-je?)
- Friedrich Heer, The Medieval World, transl. J. Sondheimer, London 1962
- Histoire de la Littérature Française, ed. J. Calvet, 9 vols, Paris 1931-6, vol. I: R. Bossuat, Le Moyen Âge, Paris 1931
- L'Histoire Littéraire de la France, ouvrage commencé par des religieux bénédictins de St-Maur et continué par des membres de l'Institut, Paris 1865-- (Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres)
- E. Hoepffner, "Matière et sens dans le roman d'Erec et Enide", Archivum Romanicum 18 (1934), pp. 433-450
- , "Les Lais de Marie de France dans Galeran de Bretagne et Guillaume de Dole", Romania LVI (1930), pp. 212-235
- , "Renart ou Renaut?", Romania LXII (1936), pp. 196-231
- M. Huby, "Adaptation courtoise et société ou 'La réalité dépasse la fiction'", Etudes Germaniques 29 (1974), pp. 289-301
- J. Huizinga, The Waning of the Middle Ages, trans. F. Hopman, London 1929
- In Pursuit of Perfection. Courtly love in Medieval Literature: a collaborative study, ed. Joan Ferrante and George Economou, Port Washington and London 1975 (National University Publications, Series in Literary Criticism)
- Penelope Johnson, La Châtelaine: the Noble Partner-Wife in Anglo-French Feudal Society, unpublished dissertation, University of Yale History Department, 1973
- Rosemarie M. Jones, The Theme of Love in the "Romans d'Antiquité", London 1972 (Modern Humanities Research Association, Dissertation series, 5)
- P. Jonin, Les Personnages Féminins dans les Romans français de Tristan au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle, Aix-en-Provence, 1958 (Publication des Annales de la Faculté des Lettres, Aix-en-Provence)
- F. Joüon des Longrais, "Le Statut de la Femme dans le Droit Commun Médiéval", in La Femme, II, Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin XII (1962), pp. 135-241
- G.H. Joyce, Christian Marriage, London 1948
- W. Kellermann, "Les Types Psychologiques de l'Amour dans les Romans de Chrétien de Troyes", Marche Romane XX (1970), pp. 31-39
- Douglas Kelly, Chrétien de Troyes, an Analytic Bibliography, London 1976 (Research Bibliographies and Checklists, 17)
- , "The Composition of Aimon de Varennes' Florimont", Romance Philology 23 (1970), pp. 277-292
- , "Courtly Love in Perspective: the Hierarchy of Love in Andreas Capellanus", Traditio 24 (1968), pp. 119-147
- H.A. Kelly, Love and Marriage in the Age of Chaucer, Ithaca and London 1975

- G.L. Kittredge, "Chaucer's Discussion of Marriage", Modern Philology IX (1911-12), pp. 435-467
- Otto Klapp, Bibliographie der Französischen Literaturwissenschaft, Frankfurt-am-Main, 1960--
- Erich Köhler, Ideal und Wirklichkeit in der Höfischen Epik. Studien zur Form der frühen Artus- und Graldichtung, Tübingen 1956 (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie, 97)
- , L'Aventure Chevaleresque. Idéal et Réalité dans le Roman Courtois, trans. Eliane Kaufholz, Paris 1975
- , "Les Romans de Chrétien de Troyes", in Problèmes d'une Sociologie du Roman, Brussels 1963 (Travaux de l'Institut de Sociologie 36), pp. 271-284
- , "Sens et Fonction du Terme 'Jeunesse' dans la Ppésie des Troubadours", in Mélanges offerts à René Crozet, 2 vols, Poitiers 1966, vol. I, pp. 567-583 (CCM Supplément)
- O. Kratins, "Love and Marriage in Three Versions of 'The Knight of the Lion'", Comparative Literature 16 (1964), pp. 29-39
- Louis Kukenheim, Henri Roussel, Guide de la Littérature française du Moyen Age, 3rd edition, Leiden 1963
- C.V. Langlois, La Vie en France au Moyen Age, 4 vols, Paris 1925-28 (vol.I: La Vie...d'après des Romans Mondains du Temps; vol.II: La Vie...d'après des Moralistes du Temps; vol.III: La Connaissance de la Nature et du Monde; vol.IV: La Vie Spirituelle)
- Helen C.R. Laurie, "Eneas and the Lancelot of Chrétien de Troyes", Medium Aevum 37 (1968), pp. 142-156
- Moshé Lazar, Amour Courtois et "Fin'Amors" dans la Littérature du XIIe siècle, Paris 1964 (BFR Série C, 8)
- G. Le Bras, "Le Mariage dans la Théologie et le Droit de l'Eglise du XIe au XIIIe siècle", CCM XI (1968), pp. 191-202
- F. Lecoy, "Un Episode du Protheselaus et le Conte du Mari Trompé", Romania 76 (1955), pp. 477-518
- , "Sur Quelques Passages Difficiles du Guillaume de Dole", Romania 82 (1961), pp. 244-260
- Marie-Noëlle Lefay-Toury, "Roman breton et Mythes Courtois. L'Evolution du Personnage Féminin dans les Romans de Chrétien de Troyes", CCM XV (1972), pp. 193-204 and 283-293
- , La Tentation du Suicide dans le Roman français du XIIe siècle, Paris 1978 (Essais sur le Moyen Age, 4)
- Pierre Le Gentil, "A Propos d'Amadas et Ydoine", Romania 71 (1950), pp. 359-370
- , La Littérature française au Moyen Age, 4th edition, Paris 1972
- M.D. Legge, Anglo-Norman Literature and its Background, Oxford 1963
- , "Sur la Genèse du Roman de Fergus", in Mélanges de Linguistique Romane et de Philologie Médiévale offerts à M. Delbouille, 2 vols, Gembloux 1964, vol. II, pp. 399-408
- Rita Lejeune, L'Oeuvre de Jean Renart, contribution à l'étude du genre romanesque au moyen âge, Liège and Paris 1935 (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, LXI)
- , "Le Personnage d'Amelis dans le Roman de 'L'Escoufle' de Jean Renart", in Mélanges de Littérature du Moyen Age au XXe siècle offerts à Jeanne Lods, 2 vols, Paris 1978, vol. I, pp. 378-392 (Collection de l'Ecole Normale Supérieure de Jeunes Filles, 10)



Gabriel Lepointe, Droit Romain et Ancien Droit Français, régimes matrimoniaux, libéralités, successions, Paris 1958

F. Lot and R. Fawtier, eds: Histoire des Institutions Françaises du Moyen Age, 3 vols, Paris 1957-62 (vol. I: Les Institutions Seigneuriales, by M. de Bouard et al.; vol. II: Les Institutions Royales, by F. Lot and R. Fawtier; vol. III: Les Institutions Ecclesiastiques, by J-F. Lemarignier, Jean Gaudemet and G. Mollat)

Myrrha Lot-Borodine, De l'Amour Profane à l'Amour Sacré, Paris 1961

-----, La Femme et l'Amour au XIIe siècle, d'après les Poèmes de Chrétien de Troyes, Paris 1909

-----, Le Roman Idyllique au Moyen Age, Paris 1913

Claude Luttrell, The Creation of the First Arthurian Romance: a Quest, London 1974

Faith Lyons, Les Eléments Descriptifs dans le Roman d'Aventures au XIIIe siècle, Geneva 1965 (PRF 84)

-----, "The Literary Originality of Galeran de Bretagne", in Medieval Miscellany presented to E. Vinaver, London and New York 1965, pp. 206-219

-----, "Sentiment et Rhetorique dans l'Yvain", Romania 83 (1962), pp. 370-377

The Meaning of Courtly Love. Papers of the first annual conference of the Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, State University of New York at Binghamton, Albany 1968

Philippe Ménard, "La Déclaration Amoureuse dans la Littérature Arthurienne au XIIe siècle", CCM 13 (1970), pp. 33-42

-----, Le Rire et le Sourire dans le Roman Courtois en France au Moyen Age, 1150-1250, Geneva 1969 (PRF 105)

R. Metz, "Recherches sur la Condition de la Femme selon Gratien", Studia Gratiana XII (1967), pp. 377-396 (Collectanea Kuttner, II)

-----, "Le Statut de la Femme en Droit Canonique Médiévale", in La Femme II, Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin XII (1962), pp. 59-113

E.J. Mickel, "A Reconsideration of the Lais of Marie de France", Speculum 46 (1971), pp. 39-65

J.B. Molin, P. Mutembé, Le Rituel du Mariage en France du XIIe au XVIe siècle, Paris 1974

René Nelli, L'Erotique des Troubadours, Toulouse 1963 (Bibliothèque Méridionale 2me Série, 38)

H. Newstead, "Besieged Ladies in Arthurian Romance", PMLA 63 (1948), pp. 502-530

-----, "The Traditional Background of Partonopeus de Blois", PMLA 61 (1946), pp. 916-946

W.A. Nitze, "Erec and the Joy of the Court", Speculum 29 (1954), pp. 691-701

-----, "The Romance of Erec, Son of Lac", Modern Philology XI (1913-14), pp. 445-489

-----, "Yvain and the Myth of the Fountain", Speculum 30 (1955), pp. 170-9

J.T. Noonan, Jr, "Marital Affection in the Canonists", Studia Gratiana XII (1967), pp. 476-509 (Collectanea Kuttner II)

F. Olivier-Martin, Précis d'Histoire du Droit Français, 5th edition, Paris 1951

- W. Onclin, "L'Age Requis pour le Mariage dans la Doctrine Canonique Médiévale", in Proceedings of the 2nd International Congress of Medieval Canon Law, ed. S. Kuttner and J.J. Ryan, Vatican City 1965, pp. 237-247
- D.D.R. Owen, "Profanity and its Purpose in Chrétien's Cligès and Lancelot", FMLS 6 (1970), pp. 37-48
- Gaston Paris, "Cligès (compte-rendu de l'édition Foerster, 1901)", Journal des Savants 1902, pp. 57-69, 289-309, 345-354, 438-458, 641-655
- , "Etude sur les Romans de la Table Ronde. Lancelot du Lac. II: Le Conte de la Charrette", Romania XII (1883), pp. 439-534
- , La Littérature Française au Moyen Age (XIe-XIVe siècle), 5th edition, Paris 1913
- , Mélanges de Littérature Française du Moyen Age, ed. M. Roques, 2 pts, Paris 1910-1912
- Albert Pauphilet, "Eneas et Enée", Romania 55 (1929), pp. 195-213
- , Le Legs du Moyen Age. Etudes de Littérature Médiévale, Melun 1950 (Bibliothèque Elzévirienne, nouvelle série: Etudes et Documents)
- J.C. Payen "La Destruction des Mythes Courtois dans le Roman Arthurien: la femme dans le roman en vers après Chrétien de Troyes", Revue des Langues Romanes 78 (1960), pp. 213-228
- , Le Moyen Age, 2 vols, Paris 1970-71, vol. I: Des Origines à 1300
- Régine Pernoud, La Femme au Temps des Cathédrales, Paris 1980
- P. Petot, "L'Autorisation du Seigneur au Mariage", RHDFE 25 (1948), pp. 377-378
- P. Petot, A. Vandenbossche, "Le Statut de la Femme dans les Pays Coutumiers Français du XIIIe au XVIIe siècle", La Femme II, Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin XII (1962), pp. 244-254
- John F. Plummer, "'Bien dire' and 'Bien apprendre' in Chrétien's Erec et Enide", Romania 95 (1974), pp. 380-394
- Eileen Power, Medieval Women, ed. M.M. Postan, Cambridge 1975
- , "The Position of Women", in The Legacy of the Middle Ages, ed. C.G. Crump and E.F. Jacob, Oxford 1926, pp. 401-433
- A.R. Press, "The Adulterous Nature of Fin'amors. A Re-examination of the Theory", FMLS 6 (1970), pp. 327-341
- F. Ragueau, Glossaire du Droit Français, ed. M. Eusèbe de Laurière, 2 vols, Paris 1704
- T.B.W. Reid, The 'Tristan' of Béroul: a Textual Commentary, Oxford 1972
- John R. Reinhard, The Old French Romance of 'Amadas et Ydoine'. An Historical Study, Durham, North Carolina, 1927
- D.W. Robertson, Jr, "The Doctrine of Charity in Medieval Literary Gardens: a Topical Approach through Symbolism and Allegory", Speculum 26 (1951), pp. 24-49
- , A Preface to Chaucer, Princeton 1963
- , "Some Medieval Literary Terminology, with special reference to Chrétien de Troyes", Studies in Philology 48 (1951), pp. 669-692
- , "The Subject of the De Amore of Andreas Capellanus", Modern Philology 50 (1952-3), pp. 145-161
- The Role of Woman in the Middle Ages, ed. Rosemarie Thee Morewedge, Albany 1975 (6th Annual Conference of the Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, State University of New York at Binghamton)

Sacraments in Scripture, ed. T. Worden, London and Dublin 1966

Winifred Schleiner, "Rank and Marriage; a Study of the Motif of 'Woman Wilfully Tested'", Comparative Literature Studies 9 (1972), pp. 365-375

F. Schlösser, "Die Minneauffassung des Andreas Capellanus und die zeitgenössische Weltbild", Zeitschrift für Deutsche Philologie 79 (1960), pp. 266-284

M. Schuhmacher, Die Auffassung der Ehe in den Dichtungen Wolframs von Eschenbach, Heidelberg 1967

M.A. Screech, The Rabelaisian Marriage: Aspects of Rabelais's Religion, Ethics and Comic Philosophy, London 1958

M.M. Sheehan, "The Influence of Canon Law on the Property Rights of Married Women in England", Mediaeval Studies 25 (1963), pp. 109-124

V.S. Sheldon, "Why does Chrétien's Erec Treat Enide so Harshly?", Romanic Review 5 (1914), pp. 115-126

Marie-José Southworth, Etude Comparée de Quatre Romans Médiévaux: 'Jaufré', 'Fergus', 'Durmart', 'Blancandin', Paris 1973

Lage F.W. Stael von Holstein, Le Roman d'Athis et Prophilias. Etude Littéraire sur ses deux Versions, Uppsala 1909

Jean Subrenat, "Sur le Climat Social, Moral, Religieux du Tristan de Bérout", Le Moyen Age 82 (1976), pp. 219-261

Martine Thiry-Stassin, "Interpellations Féminines dans le Roman de Troie de Benoit de Sainte-Maure", in Mélanges de Langue et Littérature Françaises du Moyen Age offerts à P. Jonin, Aix-en-Provence and Paris 1979, pp. 645-660 (Senefiance 7)

A. Tobler, E. Lommatzsch, Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch, Berlin, Wiesbaden, 1915--

Juliette M. Turlan, "Amis et Amis Charnels d'après les Actes du Parlement au XIVe siècle", RHDFE 47 (1969), pp. 645-698

-----, "Recherches sur le Mariage dans la Pratique Coutumière (XIIe-XVIe siècles)", RHDFE 35 (1957), pp. 477-528

É. Vinaver, The Rise of Romance, Oxford 1971

J. Vincent, "Douaire Préfix et Quotité Coutumière dans la Jurisprudence du Parlement de Paris au XIVe siècle", RHDFE 48 (1970), pp. 568-616

W. von Wartburg, Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch, Tübingen, Basle 1948--

F.M. Warren, "The Works of Jean Renart, Poet, and their Relation to Galeran de Bretagne", Modern Language Notes 23 (1908), pp. 69-73 and 97-100

C.B. West, Courtoisie in Anglo-Norman Literature, Oxford 1938

B.J. Whiting, "Gawain: his Reputation, his Courtesy and his Appearance in Chaucer's Squire's Tale", Mediaeval Studies 9 (1947), pp. 189-234

M. Wilmotte, Un Curieux Cas de Plagiat Littéraire: le Poème de "Galeran", Paris 1928 (Extrait des Bulletins de l'Académie Royale de Belgique, Classe des Lettres, 5e série, vol. XIV)

B.H. Wind, "L'Ideologie Courtoise dans les Lais de Marie de France", in Mélanges de Linguistique Romane et de Philologie Médiévale offerts à M. Delbouille, 2 vols, Gembloux 1964, vol. II, pp. 741-748

B. Woledge, "Bons Vavasseurs et Mauvais Sénéchaux", in Mélanges offerts à Rita Lejeune, 2 vols, Gembloux 1969, vol. II, pp. 1263-1277

P. Zumthor, "Le Texte Médiéval et l'Histoire. Propositions Méthodologiques", Romanic Review 64 (1973), pp. 5-15